

An Apology <sup>1</sup>  
OR PLEA  
FOR THE  
TWO TREATISES,  
AND  
Appendix to them concerning INFANT-  
BAPTISME; Published Decemb. 15. 1645.

Against the unjust charges, complaints, and cen-  
sures of Doctor Nathanael Homes, Mr John Gere, <sup>1</sup>  
Mr Stephen Marshall, Mr John Ley, and Mr William  
Hussey; together with a Postscript by way of reply  
to Mr Blakes answer to Mr Tombes his letter, and  
Mr Edmund Calamy, and Mr Richard Vines  
Preface to it.

Wherein the principall heads of the Dispute concerning  
Infant-Baptism are handled, and the insufficiency of the  
writings opposed to the two Treatises  
manifested.

---

By IOHN TOMBES, B. D.

*h* GAL. 4. 16.

*Am I therefore become your enemy, because I tell you the truth?*

---

Aug: 28 <sup>4</sup>

LONDON,

Printed for Giles Calvert, at the Black Spread-Eagle at  
the West end of PAULS. 1646.

# An Apology OR PLEA FOR THE TWO TREATISES AND

Appendix to them concerning Infant  
Baptism; Published Decemb: 17 1644.



Wherein the principal heads of the Dispute concerning  
Infant-Baptism are handled, and the insufficiency of the  
writings opposed to the two Treatises  
manifested.

By Iohn Tombes, B. D.

Printed for Iohn Tombes, at the Black-Swan in St. Dunstons Church in London.

Printed for Iohn Tombes, at the Black-Swan in St. Dunstons Church in London.  
the West end of PAULS. 1646.





To the right worshipfull my much ho-  
noured Auditors, members of the Ho-  
nourable, House of COMMONS, and  
Societies of the Temple.



After other meanes duly but without successe  
tried, for the publique good, to wit the vin-  
dicating of truth, and consequently for the  
preventing of the establishment of an error  
and corruption of the most solemn sacred  
rite of the Christian profession, and the op-  
pression of them that oppose it, I consented to  
the publishing of two treatises in December  
last about Infant-baptisme. It seemed good to sundry persons of note  
presently to cry downe my assertions, and to load me with unjust ac-  
cusations, which I take to be rather a baffeling of the Author, then an  
answering of his writing. Yet the truth hath gotten so much ground  
(howevar some eminent men pretend otherwise) that the Doctrine  
of the Directory is disproved by two of the most eminent of my An-  
tagonists, as is shewed §9. pag. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. of this Apology,  
the chiefe argument of my prime Antagonist, is proved to be either  
unratury or fallacious, §. 10. pag. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. of this Apolo-  
gy, sundry confessions are drawne from my Antagonists, which in my  
judgement, and I think in the judgement of any that knows what  
belongs to disputes, do yeld the cause, as those that I mention §. 18.  
pag 97. 98. 100. 101. 102. & §. 5. page 28. of this Apology. And  
as for the accusations against my selfe, I should sleight them, were  
it not they had a great influence upon the cause, and therefore have  
been necessitated to vindicate my selfe; and therewith the truth in

## The Epistle Dedicatoy.

some measure by this Apology. The great prejudice against me in Point of antiquity, I have also in this Apology endeavoured to dispell, specially that from the testimony of Augustin, Sermon. 10. de verbis Apostoli, tom. 10. which upon examination I find not to be an historicall narration from good records, but a meer hyperbolicall speech, Rhetorically asserting a thing by conjecture from present use in a Sermon to the people, §. 15. pag. 81. 82. 83. 84. of this Apology. And for the testimony of Tertullian concerning federall holinesse, it is shewed to be impertinent, §. 15. pag. 84. 85. That the present Synod or reformed Churches are against me should be no more prejudice against me, then it is against the Synod, and reformed Churches that they oppose the Doctrine of Infant-baptisme, as it was taught by Cyprian, and his councill of 66. Bishops, Augustin, and many Synods, and Churches all along till the fifteenth century, and the Augustan confession art 9.

The danger of troubles upon a reformation of this corruption should make men wary how they introduce them; I think they that are bound by Covenant to reforme, yet are not bound to do it with precipitation, and without prudence. But however men must take heed how they establish an error and corruption by a Law, and oppresse men for holding a truth, lest they kicke against the Pricke.

As for my owne particular, the hard dealing I have found doth not alienate me from my brethren, nor I hope shall make a schisme between us; if it must happen, my indeavour is, that it may be necessary, not voluntary on my part. What hath happened I looke upon it, however meant by men, yet as ordered by God for good, to wit the clearing of the truth, the trying and humbling of my selfe. That I suffer in the repute of men, or my outward peace moves me not. It's not to be expected children should be born without travail, nor truth without suffering; yet to leave so intelligent an Auditory, with so much advantage of the fruite of my labours, is no small grievance. However I have chosen you for depositaries, in whose hands I may leave this Apology; that you may not be strangers to this businesse, nor forget him who is

From my study at the Temple  
in London, August 20. 1646.

Your reall servant in  
the things of Christ;

JOHN TOMBS.



## The Contents of the Apology.

- P**ag. 1. Sect. 1. Of the occasion of writing this Apology.
- Pag. 2. Sect. 2. Of the intention of the Author upon that occasion.
- Sect. 3. Of the necessity and seasonableness of publishing the two treatises about Infant-baptisme.
- Pag. 3. Sect. 4. Of freedom from publishing the two treatises contrary to engagement, with a Declaration of the Authors proceedings therein.
- Pag. 16. Sect. 5. Of the clearing the Author of the two treatises from scornfulness in writing them, of my censure of Mr Tho: Goodwins handling this point, and of all writers about Colos. 2. 12.
- Pag. 28. Of the exposition I give of Colos. 2. 12. confessed to be right by Mr Marshall himselfe.
- Pag. 30. Sect. 6. Of the clearing the Author of the *Examen* from either justifying the Anabaptists in Germany, or condemning the godly and grave nonconformists in England.
- Pag. 36. Sect. 7. Of the clearing of the Author of the two treatises from vaunting and challenging in the composing and publishing the treatises.
- Pag. 39. Sect. 8. Of the clearing of the Author of the two treatises from sophistry in them, whereby occasion is taken to vindicate the Treatises in many of the chiefe things contained in them.
- Pag. 40. Sect. 9. Of the meaning of M. Marshall second conclusion, the words in the Directory [*the promise is made to believers and their seed*] and the doctrine therein delivered, disavowed by M. Marshall and M. Gever.
- Pag. 44. Sect. 10. Of the distinction of inward & outward covenant, & that it can stand M. M. in no stead, but to shew his trifling & equivocating in his first argument, and two first conclusions, and of master Marshalls mistake of my opinion.
- Page 49. Sect. 10. Of master Marshalls false and most unjust charge that I carry a Socinian plot through my *Examen* and *Exercitation*.
- Pag. 53. Sect. 12. Of Mr Marshalls unjust charge of my itching after new opinions, and particularly about rebaptization and receiving the Lords Supper afore baptism.
- Page 53. Sect. 13. Of alleaging authors against their mind, particularly master Daniel Rogers master Ball, Chamier, Arétin, and Beza.
- Pag. 60. Sect. 14. Of master Marshalls unjust charging Anabaptists with a bloody sentence, condemning all the infants of believers, as having nothing to doe with the covenant of Grace, his imputing to me as if I held that they all belong actually to the kingdom of the devill, no more promise for them, then for children of Turks, their actuall standing in the visible kingdom of the devill.
- Pag. 67. A large disquisition of Rom 11. 27. &c. wherein is shewed that the ingrafting there is into the invisible Church by election and giving faith, and that it proves not Infant-baptisme.
- Pag. 78. Sect. 15. Of master Marshalls unjust charge against me as darkning his argument, and casting filth in the face of the Assembly.
- Pag. 80. Sect. 16. Of master Marshalls untrue charge against me, as if I rested on Grocius in setting down the tenent of Antiquity upon occasion of which the tenent of Antiquity is again examined; my judgement of their doctrine vindicated: master Marshalls new allegations answered, and my diligence to find out their tenets manifested.
- Pag. 91. Sect. 17. Of my opinion about excommunication, Church-government, the admission unto all ordinances, my former conformity alleaged to alienate mens minds from me and my writings.
- Pag. 91. Sect. 18. Of the vanity of master Leyes vaunt concerning the deadly wound given to my cause, and the contrary demonstrated



## The Contents.

- by a brieve going through the principall points about this argument, as they have hitherto been disputed. As about *Acts* 2. 39. *Rom.* 11. 16. *Colos.* 2. 12. *Mat.* 28. 19. *Acts* 16. 15. *Mat.* 19. 14. &c.
- Pag. 97.** Baptisme and the rite of eating bread and drinking wine at the passeover, though old rites among the Jewes, yet used to another end and after another rule by christians.
- Pag. 98.** The command confessed to be the formal reason of circumcision by *mr. marshall*. Circumcision a priviledge proper to the Jewish Church-State.
- Pag. 99.** No command about the Jewes Sacraments now in force.
- Pag. 100.** Infants not disciples as *Mat.* 28. 19 is meant.
- Baptizing households inferres not infant-baptisme.
- Pag. 101.** We have no evidence for judgement of charity concerning infants, nor is a judgement of charity to be our rule in administering baptisme.
- Pag. 102. sect. 19.** Of master *Hassie* his pretended satisfactory answer to my *Exercitation*.
- Pag. 106. Sect. 20.** The Epilogue of this *Apology* concerning the reason of the enlarging of it, the Authours present estate and future intentions.
- ### The Contents of the *Postscript*.
- Page 109. Sect. 1.** The occasion of this *Postscript*.
- 2. sect. 2.** Of *M. Calamy*, and *Mr. V. nes* their wrong judgement of the dispute, *mastr. Blakes* book and my discussing the point.
- P. 111. sect. 3.** Of master *Blakes* charge of defect of charity, and some other imputations.
- Pag. 112. sect. 4.** They that deny infant-baptisme need not teach that infants perish.
- Pag. 113. sect. 5.** Of my censure of master *Blakes* producing *Gal.* 4. 29. for the birth-priviledge.
- Pag. 114. sect. 6.** Of the necessity of my taking pains in my *Examen* to find out the meaning of master *Marshalls* second conclusion by reason of the ambiguity of his expressions.
- Pag. 120. sect. 7.** Of the *Corinthians* doubt *1 Cor.* 7. 12. 13. 14.
- Pag. 121. sect. 8.** *1 Cor.* 7. 14. is not meant of instrumental sanctification, & federal holines.
- P. 125. sect. 9.** Of *mastr. Blakes* misallegation of *Gal.* 2. 15. which was the text he chose for his birth-priviledge.
- Pag. 128. sect. 10.** That *1 Pet.* 2. 9. is meant of the Church invisible.
- Pag. 130. sect. 11.** Of precedents for womens receiving the Lords supper.
- P. 131. sect. 12.** To say that God hath promised to be the God of every beleever and his naturall seed is a new Gospel.
- P. 132. sect. 13.** Of master *Ruthersfords* and *M. Blakes* opinion about holinesse of a chosen nation, and mediate Ancestours profession intitling to infantbaptisme, and the Independents advantage in this point.
- Pag. 134. sect. 14.** Of the word [nations] *marth.* 28. 19. how to be taken.
- Pag. 135. sect. 15.** of master *Ruthersfords* and master *Blakes*, and mine opinion concerning the rule to know who are baptizable.
- Pag. 138. sect. 16.** About two suppositions ascrib'd by me to master *marshall* and master *Blake* in my *Examen*, page 130.
- Pag. 140. sect. 17.** About arguments drawne from Analogy in positive rites and their invalidity, and the insufficiency of master *Blakes* rules.
- Pag. 145. sect. 18.** That Master *Blake* hath not proved that infants are disciples from *Marth.* 28. 19. nor pertinently alleaged, *Isai.* 49. 23.
- Pag. 147. sect. 19.** Of baptizing households and in censure of *Mr. Blakes* speech concerning it.
- Pag. 149. sect. 20.** About *Marth.* 19. 14. that by the kingdom of heaven is meant the kingdom of glory.
- Pag. 151. sect. 21.** That God seales not to every person that is rightly baptized, that his covenant of grace belongs only to the elect, that his covenant is effectual, and leaves it not to mans liberty to include or exclude himselfe.
- Pag. 155. sect. 22.** Of *Mr. Blakes* unjust crimination of me as putting the children of beleivers out of the covenant of Grace, and the Epilogue of this *Postscript*.





# An Apology for the two Treatises, and Appendix to them concerning Infant-Baptisme, against the unjust Charges, Complaints and Censures of D. Nathanael Homes, M. John Geree, and M. Steven Marshall, and M. John Ley.



**D**ecember 15, 1644. were published with my consent two Treatises, and an Appendix to them concerning Infant-Baptisme. The writing that could not in nineteene moneths before obtaine a few lines, hath now gained foure answers in foure moneths. In January came forth a Treatise of one *Thomas Bakewell*, in which the Title pretends a briefe answer to my twelve doubtfull Arguments (as he styles them) against Infant-baptism in my Exercitation about it. This Treatise I think hath honour enough done it that it is named. If any man shew me any thing worth the answering in it, it may in time gain a reply. otherwise for me it may take it's rest. The next moneth was published Doctor *Homes* his Vindication of baptizing Beleevers Infants in some animadversions on my Exercitation and examen. The next moneth I received from Master *Iohn Geree* his vindication of *pædobaptism* in a full answer (as is asserted) to my twelve Arguments in my exercitation, and whatloever is rationall or materiall in my Answer to Master *Marshall*'s Sermon. The next moneth I received Master *Stephen Marshall* his defence of Infant-baptisme in

§. I.

Of the occasion of writing this Apology.

B

answer



*An Apologie for the two Treatises*

answer to my two Treatises and Appendix, in which also I am informed of two peices at least from *New-England* in which I am concerned. And unto all, or some of these, Master *John Ley* in his Epistle to Master *John Salimarsb* addes his acclamation in these words. *There be diverse Davids who are ready for a single encounter with that braving Goliath, and some have given his Cause such a wound already, as (though he may play the Montebanke with it and skin it over) will never be cured at the bottom.* Thus farre they have spoken: I presume they will allow me now liberty to speake for my selfe, and for the truth.

§. 2.  
Of the intention of the Author upon that occasion.

My Cause (as Master *Ley* calls it) containes either the manner, or the matter of my Treatises. The defence of the matter of them is the chiefe thing, and is first in my intention. But the clearing of my selfe from some complaints or charges in the manner of handling the whole businesse, is so necessary for the removing of prejudices, which would prevent reading and entertaining my writings, and do undermine my present station, that I am constrained, first to plead for my selfe, before I engage further in the Controversie: wherefore I shall answer those charges by themselves apart, that so the main question may be discussed by it selfe.

§. 3.  
Of the necessity and seasonableness of publishing the two Treatises about Infant-Baptisme.

First, Doctor *Homes* in his Epistle to the Reader hath these words. *Meane while I could not but lament the untimely birth of Master T. his Exercitation, and his unnecessary falling in travell with it, after at least sixe able Brethren, and above so many daies by nervous disputation had given him so much Cause to doubt of his Tenet, or at least a while to suspend it.* And this hath been by sundry persons objected to me, that the publishing my Booke was extremely unseasonable. Two reasons are imployed in Doctor *Homes* his words to insinuate that it was untimely, because it was unnecessary. Secondly, because it was after such a nervous disputation as he mentions.

To that of needlesnesse I answer. If it were necessary to maintaine Truth though generally opposed, when few or none were willing to appeare for it, and speciall providence called me out to do it, if it were necessary to endeavour the preventing of unjust persecution for holding a Truth, to which in Sermons and other waies Law-makers, and Magistrates were every where instigated, if it were necessary when the people of God were perplexed about



about a poynt of conscience that pertaines to their continuall practice, and disputation in publike was declined, to endeavour the bringing of Truth to light, if it were necessary for a man to keep the solemne Covenant he hath by oath bound himselfe to, though it were to his great hazzard, if it were necessary in a time of Reformation for a Minister of the Gospell to do what belonged to him to further it, if it be necessary for a Minister of the Gospell to provide for the giving of his account at the day of Jesus Christ, then it was necessary for me to fall in travell with my Exercitation and examen; for all these ends and ties concurred in the writing and publishing of my Treatises. And therefore I am assured that what I did was so necessary, that had I not done what I did, I should neither have been faithfull to Christ, nor to his people, nor to the State, nor to my own soule. I confesse my Book was untimely published in reference to my own preferment, and outward peace, I saw few or none regarded for clearing of Truth: but popular Orators, such as relate to great men, or are usefull to uphold a Party, are the men esteemed. I could not expect any other then opposition to my opinion, being against such a stream of men. But I feared that of our Lord Christ, *He that is ashamed of me and my words in this adulterous and sinfull Generation, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed when he shall come in his glory with his holy Angels.* How nervous the disputation he mentions was, I suppose the Doctor knowes not but by report, forasmuch as I never perceived him present at it. The strength, and substance of all the Arguments, as well as my memory (who was then the respondent) could beare them away, was faithfully digested by me in my Exercitation, which was composed not long after in part upon occasion of that disputation. In which disputation I was so farre from finding cause to doubt of my Tenet, that I professe sincerely both that disputation, and the severall Answers of my learned Antagonists, and reverend brethren Doctor *Homes*, and Master *Geree*, and Master *Marshall* have given me lesse cause to doubt of my Tenet, especially sith Master *Marshall* Pag. 116. of his Defence saies, *it was never asserted by him, That the Covenant of saving Grace is made to Believers and their naturall seed, and Pag. 92. The command is the cause of the existence of the duty, but the Covenant of Grace is the moove to it, and Pag. 182. he grants, that the formall*

reason (which is the adequate reason) of the Lawes being Circumscripted was the command of God, the Covenant of Grace, or their Church-state he only makes the motive to it, and the thing is related to: which with many more concessions in his Defence, and the others Answers I doubt not, but if the Lord vouchsafe me time and liberty to improve to the overthrow of his first and maine Argument, and the inference he makes from the Texts of Scripture he brings to confirme it, and consequently his whole Cause, as he himselfe confesseth in his Sermon. Pag. 26. And for giving me cause to suspend my *Tenet*; if he mean by suspension, stifling my doubts in mine own bosome, and never imparting them to learned men for resolution, it had been in my apprehension extreame imprudence, if not stupidity, to have let slip the opportunity of making known the reasons of my doubts in this juncture of time, in which by Covenant the State was engaged to settle worship, Catechizing, confession of faith, discipline according to Gods Word, to each of which this point is of no small moment: if he meane by suspending my *Tenet* the not printing my writings, neither am I justly to be blamed therein, considering how long I waited, and yet never received any resolution, and after I say not, a moneth only, but ten moneths at least waiting for an answer about my motion to Master Marshall in the Epilogue of my Examen, it was plainly rejected. And though Master Marshall excuseth himselfe by relating that I declared to him, that I could, and thus I intimated to him I would keep the opinion private to my selfe (in which either his memory or his apprehension were defective) and therefore took no further thought of examining my *Treatises*, yet I suppose it concerned Master Marshall for many reasons to have contrived some course for my satisfaction, or the abatement of height of pride, and confidence which the perturbation of his mind, rather than the true intelligence of my spirit in that businesse made him imagine in my writings. As for the unreasonableness in politicke respects (though I do not take upon me insight therein) yet so farre as my reason is able to discern, it could never have come more seasonably, to have a matter of such moment discussed, while Reformation, and Lawes confirming it were yet *in fieri*, all men knowing, that it is too late to speake, when the Legislative power hath fully enacted a Law. And whereas Master Marshall saies, he verily thought I would have

sate



sate quietly down, preached, kept my opinion to my self, and not have any further appeared (especially at this time) to encrease the flame of our divisions, and confusions, I answer. For my quiet sitting down, and preaching Christ, I can boldly and cheerfully appeal to my Auditors of these Honourable Societies, whereof not a few are eminent persons, in the Honourable house of Commons. For my appearing at this time I have given reasons, which I suppose conscientious men will conceive weighty, yea and preponderating any divisions that may happen, if that of *Augustine* be true, *præstat ut scandalum admittatur, quam veritas avertatur*. Nor do I know that any such divisions or confusions have happened by reason of my Treatises, or are likely to happen, but rather the contrary. And if any divisions be now about that opinion they were afore my Treatises were published, and if they encrease they are rather to be imputed to the violence of those Preachers, who instigate the Magistrate so extirpate such as Heretickes, who hold the opinion, then to me, who by practice and profession do hold Communion with them, that differ from me, and abhorre separation from my Brethren in this regard. Nor do I doubt but that if it were not for the rigour of many Preachers, a way might be found for Reformation in this matter without such a flame of division and confusion, as Master *Marshall* apprehends. But I wish that as in *Germany* the rigidness of some men was the destruction of the Protestants there, so it happen not in like manner in *England*.

Another objection I meet with is, that I have printed my Treatises contrary to the intimation, or (as some allege) promise I made to Master *Marshall*: which Master *Marshall* writing to me thus expresseth. Pag. 1, 2. of his Defence. But when after some friendly conference with you, you declared to me, that if you might enjoy liberty to exercise your Ministry in some place, where you should not be put upon the practice of baptizing of Infants, you could (yea and intimated to me that you would) keep this opinion private to your self, provided only, that if any should preach in your pulpit for the baptizing of them, you should take your self bound in the same place so preach against it; otherwise mens preaching or printing abroad should be no provocation to you. And Pag. 244. Master *Marshall* saith thus. For even so New England have some sent your writings, and sufficiently in them showed your scorn of Master *Thomas Goodwin*,

S. 4.  
Of freedom from publishing the two Treatises contrary to engagement, with a Declaration of the Authors proceedings therein.



Master Vines and my selfe, as our friends do from thence write us  
to us.

That I may clearly and fully answer this charge, and the former, and state my selfe, and proceedings right in the thoughts of men, I think it necessary to make this following Declaration. It hapned that in the yeare 1627. reading the Catechisme Lecture at *Magdalen Hall* in *Oxford*, and having occasion in one of my Lectures to examine whether there be such a priviledge to the children of Beleevers, that they should be accounted to belong to the Covenant, and Church of God, I found not sufficient ground either from *Gen. 17. 7.* or from the institution of Circumcision for the affirmative in that question. The substance of my reasons then against the Argument drawn from Circumcision to baptisme, I have compacted in that short discourse, which is part. 2, §. 8. Pag. 29. of my Examen, and begins at those words, I dare not assent &c. Which being the chiefe thing I stand upon, I wonder Master *Marshall* so lightly passeth over calling it a tedious discourse, altering my words, and saying nothing to the reason I bring. Wherefore then, and since I declined the urging of those reasons for it, and wholly rested on *1 Cor. 7. 14.* conceiving that those words [*but now are they holy*] did import that priviledge to the children of a Beleeving Parent. And accordingly practised baptizing of Infants upon the warrant of that Text only, as I often told my Auditors at *Leicester* in *Heresford-shire*, which some now about the City can witnesse. It happened after I was necessitated to leave my place through the violence of the Kings Party, after much wandring up and down with much danger to me and mine. I came to the City of *Bristol*, and there preached for halfe a yeare, in which time in dispute with an Antipædobaptist, I urged that Text *1 Cor. 7. 14.* which he answered with so much evidence, as that although I did not fully assent unto him, yet as one that durst not oppose Truth who ever brought it, I resolved with my selfe to consider that matter more fully, and to that end being enfeebled with labour in preaching, and grieve by reason of the publike losses at that time, and advised by my Physitian to remove out of *Bristol*, understanding the Assembly was to sit in *July* 1643, I resolved to adventure a journey to *London* through *Wiltshire*, to conferre with my Brethren of the Assembly, and by the advantage of Books in  
London

London to make further search into that point. It pleased God to stop my journey then by that sad, and unexpected overthrow neere *Devizes*, which necessitated me to get away from *Bristol* by Sea into *Pembrokeshire*. While I was there I chanced to meet with *Vossius* his theses de *pædobaptismo*, and therein reading *Cyprians* and others of the Ancients Testimonies, I suspected that in point of antiquity the matter was not so cleare as I had taken it, but weighing those passages, I conceived that the Ancients held only baptizing of Infants in the case of supposed necessity, conceiving that by baptisme Grace was given, and that all are to be saved from perishing and after in processe of time it became ordinary.

Wherefore I resolved if ever I came to *London*, to search further into those two points of the meaning of *1 Cor. 7. 14.* and the History of *Pædobaptisme*, and accordingly God having brought my wife and children with much difficulty to me after a second plunder, and by remarkable providence turning the wind against the Ships when they went without us bringing us out of *Pembrokeshire* the day before it was appointed by the Kings Forces to send to apprehend me, making the wind serve for a speedy voyage in foure dayes from *Milford Haven* to the *Downes*, presently upon the receiving us into the Ship (which I hope I shall ever remember to the praise of our God) being come to *London* September 22. 1643. I applied my selfe to enquire into the points forenamed. It happened that whereas I had this prejudice against the interpreting of the holinesse of the children *1 Cor. 7. 14.* of Legitimation that no learned Protestant had so expounded it, meeting with *Camertonius* his notes not long before printed at *Cambridge*, I found him of that opinion, and after him *Musculus* and *Melancthon*, and finding that the Sanctification in the forepart of the verse, must be understood of lawfull copulation, expressed by *Beza* thus, *Fidelis uxor potest cum infideli marito bona conscientia consuescere*, which sense only was suitable to the case resolved by the Apostle whether they might still continue together, I observed that the Apostle speaking of the unbelieving party mentions his unbelieve, but when he mentions the Beleever, expresseth only the relation of husband and wife, and that the reason of the Apostle to prove their lawfull copulation is an Argument *ab absurdo* and including this proposition. *All those children whereof one of the parents is not sanctified*



*An Apologie for the two Treatises*

*sanctified to the other by lawfull copulation are unclean*, which being expounded of federall uncleanness were false, and is only true of bastardy, I concluded, that it was the meaning of the Apostle, and could be no other. Whereupon when in a meeting of Ministers in the City of *London*, the question was propounded what Scripture there was for Infant-baptisme, I told my Brethren plainly, that I doubted there was none. This occasioned the Dispute Doctor *Homes* speaks of which happened about *January 1643*. Concerning which though some gave out I was satisfied by it, others that I was so convinced, that I had nothing to say, yet the truth is, this was all the ground of those reports, that having at first stood upon it that [*the* *text* of such *Matth. 19. 14*] was meant only of such like, it being urged that then it could not be a reason, why they should suffer those children to be brought to Christ, I yeilded that it was to be expounded as *Beza* expounded it, *horum & similiarum ut supra*, as I expresse in my Exercitation, and further granted that if when Christ saith [*of these is the Kingdom of God*] he meant of their present state of regeneration they might be baptized, but that our Saviour meant it of their present state I did not grant: and I further yeilded that I should not sticke at the baptisme of an Infant concerning whom I should be certified from God that it was actually regenerate, and beleeving, meaning no more but this, that such a certificate would warrant me in such a case to baptize, it being all one with a profession of faith, as signes made by a dumbe person that he was a Christian would warrant his baptisme. This concession being made meerey upon a supposition of an extraordinary revelation, first Master *Blake*, and after him Master *Marshall* have often urged, though they have been often tould, that a common rule cannot be drawn from an extraordinary case. Not long after that Conference, my most loving and reverend Father in law Master *Henry Scudder* fearing the event of this matter, after some writing that past betweene us, advised me to draw up the reasons of my doubts, and he undertook to present them to the Committee chosen (as I conceived it) to give satisfaction about that point, which I conceived might well be by the leave of the Parliament, as the appointing the Assembly to give satisfaction about some doubts in making the Covenant. And if the Committee as a Committee could not do it (which



( which I suppose they might have done by communicating what after debate was prepared for the Assembly, which I presume was, certainly it should have been accurately done with examination of what could be objected, afore those Articles in the Directory about this matter were passed) yet particular members might have done somewhat to satisfy me, who would have been then, and shall be yet satisfied with one convincing argument, that it was Christs appointment, that the Infants of Beleevers, because they are borne of Beleevers are to be baptized. According to the advise given in a short space, I first drew up the nine first Arguments in my Exercitation, which were delivered as I relate in my Examen in *February* and *March* 1643. and after in *July* following, the other three. Which I said in my Examen were delivered to Master *Tuckney*, but Master *Marshall* tells me he doth deny it, yet I conceive my Father *Scudder* told me so, who I am sure would speake truth, and when I read that to him he did not correct me in it, and Master *Thomas Goodwin* still saies he had them after Master *Tuckney* had perused them. Besides these Papers, that satisfaction might more compendiously be given me at the motion of my reverend Father in law, I set down in one page of a Paper in quarto, the maine ground of my doubt, and delivered it to him, whether he communicated it to any else I know not: my end was that satisfaction to me might more easily be procured. This short thing I after put in my Examen, Part. 2. §. 8. as I said above, which Master *Marshall* calls a tedious discourse, though it contains lesse then forty lines, and if it had been well answered, might have eased Master *Marshall* of the rest of his labour. Now the Papers before named, I perceived were tossed up and down from one to another, and it seemes Master *Edwards* the Controversie Lecturer at *Christ-Church* got them, and picking out some passages, but concealing others that would have cleared them under pretence of refuting them, with the writing of another which he joyned with mine, meerly abused me in the Pulpit at *Christ-Church*: which I immediately charged him with after his Sermon in the Vestry, and he only excused it by telling me he named me not, though there were sundry Ministers there that knew he meant me. But this it seemes is like Master *Edwards* his justice to other men. In this time I attended Master *Thomas Goodwins* Le-

*An Apologie for the two Treatises*

tures about that Argument, had the patience to heare Master *Edwards* his discourse at *Christ Church*, and read many Treatises and Sermons, in many of which I found rather invectives than arguments. It happened that the Parishioners of *Fanchurch* became disaffected to me, and refused to heare me, though I medled not at all with that matter in the Pulpit, and I perceived my maintenance was likely to be withdrawn at the end of the yeare. Hereupon one of the Assembly my loving friend, understanding that the Honourable Societies of the *Temples* wanted a Preacher, solicited the bringing of me thither. But the matter was by the Honourable House of Commons referred to the Assembly, who chose a Committee to nominate a Preacher for them, of which Committee Master *Marshall* was one, by whom I was rejected. Presently after which rejection, having occasion of businesse in the behalfe of some godly *Pembrokeshire* Ministers, with that worthy Gentleman Master *John White* Chaire-man of the Committee for plundered Ministers, he would needs argue with me about that point of Infant-baptisme, and after some dispute, he desired to have my answer to his argument in writing. Which occasion I tooke to lay open my condition to him in a Letter, which begot no other fruit but a little Treatise intituled, *Infants Baptisme proved lawfull by Scripture*. Shortly after in *August 1644*. I met with Master *Marshall's* Sermon, and finding the vehemency of his spirit against Antipædobaptists, and having had experience both of his, and Master *Whites* inflexiblenesse by my former writings, and seeing no likelihood of imploiment and maintenance for me and mine, except I would gather a separated Church, which I durst not do, as not knowing how to justifie such a practice, I resolved to make a full answer to Master *Marshall's* Sermon, and finished it *November 11*. and having with much difficulty transcribed one Copy, and gotten another written for me, I sent my own to Master *Marshall*, who received it *December 9 1644*. About a fortnight after Master *Marshall* sent me word, that he would find a time to speake with me: I sent him word, that for the returning answer to my writing, I would not straiten him; but forasmuch as by his rejecting me I missed being nominated to the *Temple*, and I was then brought to great straights, I requested that he would declare as occasion should offer it selfe, whether he held  
me



me fit for the Ministry or not; notwithstanding my dissent from him in that point. His answer was, he desired to know first whether I would keep my opinion to my selfe. I returned this answer in writing by my Father Scudder. I request you to returne this answer to Master Marshall, that whereas I requested him to declare whether he thought me fit for the Ministry or not, notwithstanding my dissent about Pædobaptism, and he demands of me a promise of silence in that point, I conceive he is bound by the rules of justice, mercy, and prudence to do it without requiring that condition, and that he hath no reason to be jealous of me considering my carriage in this matter. Nevertheless when I shall understand what promise he would have from me, and what is intended to be done by him for the discussing the point, and clearing of Truth, to which I ought not be wanting, and what advantage I may have by his agency for my imployment and maintenance, I shall give him a punctuall answer, and am resolved for peace sake to yeeld as farre as I may without violating the solemn Covenant I have taken, and betraying truth and innocency. Decem. 26.

This begat the friendly conference mentioned by Master Marshall, which was Decem. 30. 1644. in the morning afore the Assembly fate. At the very beginning of that Conference, Master Marshall having this last written message in his hand, & reading those words, [and he demands of me a promise of silence in that point] told me that he did not demand of me a promise of silence in that point; for that was beyond his line: this was his very expression. As soon as ever I heard those words, I conceived my selfe freed from the snare I most feared of making a promise, which as the case might stand, I could not keep with a good conscience. Then Master Marshall spake to this effect, that yet for the satisfaction of those who should enquire of him concerning me, he desired to know my intentions. Whereupon I dealt freely, that I intended not to publish my opinion in the Pulpit, if I might be where I should not be put to baptize: for I conceived it not likely, that there would be a Reformation of that thing in this Age, there having been so long a practise of Infant-Baptisme, and such a prejudice in men against the opposers of it: yet I told him that if any should preach to that people I had charge of, that which I conceived to be an error, I did resolve to oppose it there, otherwise other mens preaching abroad should be no provocation to me: So that it is cleare, I made

*An Apologie for the two Treatises*

no promise, and that intimation of mine intentions which I made was only, that I intended not to preach my opinion in that place unlesse provoked there. And this any man may perceive was my meaning by Master *Marshall*'s owne relation, in which the proviso is rightly expressed ; *That if any should preach in my Pulpit for baptizing Infants, I tooke my selfe bound in the same place to preach against it, otherwise mens preaching or printing abroad should be no provocation to me ;* to wit, to preach that opinion in that place. And whereas Master *Marshall* alleadgeth this for his *Quicquid est*, he might have remembred, that I told him in expresse termes, that if Lawes were likely to be enacted to make the deniall of Infant-Baptisme penall, I held my selfe bound in conscience to appeare in publique about that matter : yea, and Master *Marshall* told me he intended me some animadversions on my *Examen* ; whence it may be collected, that neither Master *Marshall* nor my selfe had agreed to lay aside the dispute it selfe. It is true, Master *Marshall* did endeavour to possesse me with this, *That Reformation of Congregations might be without altering the use of Infant-Baptisme.* To which I answered, that though much might be done other wayes, yet it would never be right, till Christs way of baptizing were restored. About two houres after, Master *Marshall* comming to me, in the presence of Master *Obadiab Sedgewicke*, repeating the intimation of my intention aforenamed, with the proviso, told me, *he would give testimony in my behalfe as I desired.* Upon this I parted with Master *Marshall*, and Master *Sedgewicke* walking with me, commended my proceeding in that matter, and made a notion to me, which came to nothing. Upon this I went home very chearfull, not only because I prized amity with Master *Marshall*, and there was a likely way of my imploiment and maintenance ; but chiefly because I was freed from that I feared, as a snare, the promise of silence, and there were great hopes that my brethren in the Ministry would not be rigid in ejecting out of the Ministry and Communion, those that dissented from them in that point, and so separation and mutuall persecution might be prevented (which was and is still the great feare that possesseth my spirit) and liberty might in time be given for the shining forth of the light in this thing, and by degrees Reformation might be perfected, which I conceived the only safe and happy way. Upon these



these considerations I acquainted sundry of my near friends with this mercy of God to me, and being requested to joyne in keeping a day of Thanksgiving at *Antholins*, *January* 1. following for publique mercies, I made a speciall memento in my booke of speciall passages of my life, to blesse God that day for the conference I had with Master *Marshall* in peace and amity: What Master *Marshall* did after for me I do not well know, I beleeeve he did as he promised, and after a triall of me three Lords-daies at the *Temple*, I was in the end of *January* chosen by the Treasurers, and and sundry others of the members of both the honourable Societies of the *Temples* to be their Preacher for a yeare.

After these things, being acquainted with a Law made in *New-England*, and proceedings against those that denied baptizing of Infants, I yeelded to the sending of my Examen thither, though not so large as it is now printed (for the dissertation about a speech of Master *Cotton* Part. 3. Sect. 3. Pag 42, 43. and some other things were added since) meerly to occasion the study of this matter more exactly, and to allay the vehemency of their spirits, and proceedings against those that dissented from them, and therewith I sent this short Epistle.



To all the Elders of the Churches of Christ in *New-England*, and to each in particular, by name to the Pastor and Teacher of the Church of God at *Boston* there these present.

Reverend Brethren,

**V**nderstanding that there is some disquiet in your Churches about Pædobaptisme, and being moved by some that honour you much in the Lord, and desire your comfortable account at the day of Christ, that I would yeeld that a Copy of my Examen of Master *Marshall* his Sermon of Infant-Baptisme might be transcribed to be sent to you I have con-

*An Apologie for the two Treatises*

sented thereto, and do commend it to your examination in like manner, as you may perceive by the reading of it I did to Master Marshalls; not doubting but that you will as in Gods presence, and accountable to Christ Iesus weigh the thing, remembering that of our Lord Christ, Ioh. 7. 24. Iudge not according to the appearance, but iudge righteous judgement. To the blessing of him who is your God, and our God, your Iudge, and our Iudge I leave you, and the flocke of God over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, and rest,

From my study at the Temple  
in London, May 25. 1645.

Your Brother and fellow  
servant in the worke of Christ,

JOHN TOMBES.

**T**He accounting of this act a shewing of my scorne of Master Thomas Goodwin, Master Vines, and Master Marshall, I take rather to be the effect of a distempered palat, than a right-discerning taste.

After this, sundry things happened which did induce me to yeeld to the importunity of those that sollicitied earnestly the publishing of my writings for the publike good. I had sent to Master Marshall after his returne from Scotland, to know what he would do about the motions I made in the Epilogue of my Examen, for the discussing of the point in difference between him and me. The best of the answer I received was, that *sih* I had now a place for my Ministry without baptizing Infants, he expected I would be quiet. About that time I had occasion to make triall of the Assemblies approbation of me. The Examiner told me, that there were many of the Assembly that did scruple in Conscience, the giving approbation to me because of my opinion. The Directory had been published, and an Ordinance of Parliament to make the not using it penall. Preparations were to send Bills to the King, among which I assured my selfe that would be one, which if once past, it would be



be too late to make an afterplea. The Sermons in publique were still as earnest against this tenet as ever. The people of the City much enquired into this matter. A publique disputation was once allowed about it, to which I was earnestly solicited, but for weighty reasons refused it. Sundry came to me to request the perusal of my papers for their satisfaction. many learned, godly, and prudent persons, both of them that differed in judgement, as well as those that agreed with me, moved me to have them printed, for the bringing of truth to light. I saw not wherein any danger to the State or Church might be created by the printing of them, and which was beyond all to me, I was confirmed it was a truth I held, had tried all fit meanes to have it examined, had been guided in the searching of it, and preserved for this businesse by many remarkable providences, and thereupon after prayer to God by my selfe, and with others for his direction, I yeelded to the printing of them, *not out of a restless spirit to vent my selfe, as Master Marshall imagined, nor out of any mind to encrease the divisions and confusions of the time* (then which there is nothing my spirit and waies more abhorre) but to vindicate truth, performe my duty to which I was bound by solemne Covenant, to do my best for the preventing of that sad evill of removing out of the Ministry, and out of Communion, and out of the State also them that could not yeeld to Infant-Baptisme, which is more likely then any thing to encrease our divisions, and make tumults, especially if the relations, and instigations of some fiery spirits prevaile. And in this, I doubt not but I have dealt faithfully to God and to the State, and charitably to other men, without violating any engagement, what ever I suffer in mine owne person. I must confesse had I seen any inclination in the Assembly, or Master Marshall, or other leading-men to examine my writings in a faire Scholastike way, and had I had meanes to be able to beare the charges of an impression, and no Lawes likely to be established to make the holding of my opinion penall, I had resolved not to publish my writings in *English*, but in *Latine*, and therefore I first framed my Exercitation in *Latine*, conceiving the Assembly would have apprehended my aime and intention, to be to deale only with Schollars in this matter: but all things falling out crosse to my expectation, I conceived it was the will of God it should be printed as it was. Thus much for the

§ .5.  
Of the clearing the Author of the two Treatises from scornfulness in writing them: of my censure of M. Thomas Goodwins handling this point, and of all writers about Colos.  
2. 12.

the justifying the publishing of my Treatises..

The next charge against me is my abusing my Antagonists. And in this Master Gerec in his Epistle to the Lord Mountague speakes thus.

*The Author whom I answer, hath used his opponents more courstly then was convenient to their worth, and places. But all men count his sleightings of opponents a blemish to his worke.* Master Marshall in his Defence, Pag. 244. For even thither have some sent your writings, and sufficiently in them shewed your scorne of M. Thomas Goodwin, Master Vines, and my selfe, as our friends do from thence write to us. And Pag. 53. I alleadge all this to shew, you should not thus vilifie and scorne their (meaning the Ancients) practice and gronnds, as if the Century writers, and generally all Protestant writers, yea Master Marshalls owne friend, if I mistake not, Theophilus Philokyriaces Leonardienfis in his Dies Dominica, when they note the *navi quisquilie* blemishes, and errors of Fathers, and Councils did vilifie and scorne them: which if it be an uncharitable imputation to them, it is so to me, unlesse it be thought that men cannot conceive bad enough of an Antipædobaptist. Pag. 62. throughout your whole Treatise you strive to make an ostentation of reading, and put abundance of scoffes and jeeres upon them who are of contrary mind to you. Pag. 76. You powre out such abundance of scorne upon them, who think otherwise then you do. I answer, 1. That the words interpreted as scoffing & scorning, and jeering are not such, but usuall School-expressions frequent in Schooles, and in the most temperate writings of the most moderate men of the same profession, towards them that dissent from them, so that I assure my selfe, had not my Antagonists before distasted my worke, and consequently the Author, they would not have been so construed. How ever Master Gerec say all men count my sleighting opponents a blemish to my worke, yet one I am sure commended my writing for the contrary, that I had discovered the weaknesse of the opponents by such expressions, nor did my Father Scudder except against those passages as offensive which Master Marshall doth, though more then halfe was read to him, and observed by him of purpose to avoid offence, afore it was sent to Master Marshall. 2. That there were many reasons why Master Marshall should have otherwise conceived of me in those expressions, as namely my Declaration of  
my



my intention, and petition thereupon in the prologue of the Examen, Part. 1. Sect. 1. my respective speeches of Master Marshall in the same place, Pag. 2. and Part. 2. Sect. 7. Pag. 26. and also in the Epilogue, Part. 4. Sect. 8. And if Master Marshall had remembered it, when in our friendly conference he had told me, *he did not expect so high expressions from me*, which I conceived he meant of my downright censuring of his Arguments, not contemning his abilities, and I told him I conceived it necessary to do so, because he called his Arguments undeniable, and had charged the Anabaptists with a bloody sentence, I desired an instance of such an expression as was offensive, which being given by Master Marshall, I left those words out in the printed Book, and would have dealt so with any other, had I conceived it would have been so construed. I might adde further, that when Master Geret came to me the day he published his Booke, a moneth afore Master Marshall's Defence came forth, I told him he did not conceive aright of me in that charge in his Epistle Dedicatory, and gave him my reason, and told him that I might have much wrong by it and desired that intimation might be given to Master Marshall thereof. Which whether he did or no I know not, but I supposed it might have occasioned Master Marshall if he could not alter his Copy, yet to have added something in the beginning or end of his Book, to have allayed the asperity of that charge. But what are those passages in which I powre out such abundance of scorne on Master Vines, Master Thomas Goodwin, and Master Marshall? All the passage of Master Vines thus interpreted is Examen, Part 2. Sect. 6. *But how knowes Master Vines this? I do not take Master Vines for a Prophet, and so inferre this by reason, The Anabaptist begett Matth. 28. 19. against paedobaptisme, Ergo he will urge Rom. 12. 19. against Magistracy, is in my slender apprehension a baculo ad angulum.* He had said, *the Anabaptist which urged Matth. 28. 19. against paedobaptisme when we shall be thriven to his full stature, will undermine Magistracy by Rom. 12. 19.* Which words seeme to imply, that an Anti-paedobaptist is but a young Anti-Magistrate, and that the same vegetative faculty, that is the same reason that did nourish the one would begett the other. This inference being unreasonable, yet spoken to such an Auditory by a man of such eminency at such a time, and therefore tending to the suppression of Truth, and them

that held it, I conceived it necessary to blunt the edge of it, without any scorn of him, whom I respect as my loving neighbour, but for necessary defence of truth, in a Schoole expression used by many Protestant writers, and among others, by Master Gataker in his Rejoynder to *Can* in defence of Master Bradsham, Pag. 113. As for Master Thomas Goodwin it is true, Part. 3. Sect. 7. Pag. 68. of my Examen I said thus. I remember Master Thomas Goodwin, who hath handled this matter of Pædobaptisme, by spinning out similitudes and conjectures (fit indeed for the common people that are more taken with resemblances then syllogismes) rather then with close Arguments. In this passage saies Master Marshall, Pag. 143. I stept out of the way to reproach Master Thomas Goodwin, that I vilifie him as a man who by spinning out similitudes, and conjectures deludes his Auditory with such things rather then with satisfactory arguments, that why like Ishmael my Sword should be against every man he cannot tell, that he knowes him to be a learned godly Divine, and an eminent Preacher of the Gospell of Christ, and his worth not to be blasted by my scornfull speeches, that I have set down his Notions otherwise then he preached. To all which I answer. That passage of mine was not to vilifie Master Goodwin, but to passe a right censure on his Sermons, as I did in like manner on Doctor Featleys Treatise, Pag. 143. without any vilifying of his learning, because I saw the esteem of them held men in error. Which is so frequent, and just a thing, that it was held meet that an Advertisement should be added to the new Annotations on the Bible, to prevent the danger of some passages in favour of the Prelacy and Liturgie. *Hanc veniam petimusque damusque vicissim.* And this fact of mine is most injuriously construed, as if I did this like an Ishmael that loved to have my Sword against every man, as if I affected contention: then which there could not be a thing more falsely charged on me, though in pursuance of truth I held my selfe bound to examine every mans sayings, which I tell Master Marshall in the Epilogue of my Examen, to be for exact disquisition of it. Doctor Twisse in his *Vindicia gratie* against Arminius often makes digressions, and doth vocare ad partes Molinæ, Piscator, Lubbertus, Alvarez, &c. He writes against Doctor Jackson, Master Cotton, &c. Master Gataker against Doctor Ames, Voetius, Balmford, Lucius, Gomarus, Master Walker &c. doth any man therefore make them like Ishmael whose

Sword



*Sword is against every man?* Master Marshall saies that I vilifie Master Thomas Goodwin as a man who by spinning out similitudes and coniectures deludes his Auditors, and then gives him an *Encomium*, in which he would have it believed that I charged Master Thomas Goodwin as a man wont to do thus, whereas my words are only concerning that matter of Pædobaptisme, which doth nothing prejudice him in his other workes, of which I have in my Examen, Pag. 163. given an *Encomium*. And for my censure, it was grounded partly on his own expressions, that in sundry points pertaining to that matter *we must be content with hints*, which is all one with conjectures, and partly on the maine principles of his dispute; which were, that *forasmuch as the promises to Beleevers children are indefinite, as Acts 2. 39. Luke 19. 8. God hath so cast the order of his election, that multitudes come out of the loynes of his people, that administration of the Lords Supper and Baptisme is to be by a Judgement, that we are to judge any Infant-children of Beleevers to be holy by parcels, though not all in the lumpe, that they are therefore to be accounted holy with a reall saving holinesse, 1 Cor. 7. 14. Matth. 19. 14. and therefore to be baptized according to the rule implied, Act. 10. 47.* Concerning which I say still that I expected Arguments, but counted my selfe deluded with these conjectures, as finding nothing to his purpose in any of these Texts, which were the maine he alleadged, they neither proving that God had ordered his election so as for the most part to run through the loynes of Beleevers, nor that we are to judge any of the Infants of Beleevers to be in the Covenant, or Elect by parcels, though not all in the lumpe, nor that Baptisme is to be administred by such a conjecturall or uncertaine judgement. But forasmuch as I have disputed at large in my Examen, Part. 2. Sect. 10. Part 3. Sect. 3. 4. about the promises to Beleevers children, and examined all the Texts forementioned, and shewed that we are not to administer Ordinances by our conjecturall judgement, concerning Gods Election, or inward holinesse, God having not made that the condition of his servants applying his Ordinances, which can be infallibly known to none but himselfe, as Master Marshall rightly in his Sermon of baptizing Infants, Page 3. but according to the certaine judgement of a persons profession of the faith, I shall not examine this thing here at large: only I

*An Apologie for the two Treatises*

thought it necessary to say thus much, not to vilifie Mr. Goodwin, but to shew the weakenesse of the Cause, for which no better proofes could be brought, then such uncertaine guesles even by a man so able as Master Thomas Goodwin, who hath in other things shewed his sufficiency beyond other men. And though I deny not but I might mistake him in some passages, or not exactly recite his words; yet I do not conceive I have misreported his Sermons, and however, and whenever they shall be printed, I hope I shall be able to produce the written notes of others to verifie my setting down his Notions; yet if I should mistake passages in Sermons not printed, it were excusable, in comparision of the usage I have met with from Doctor Hames, and Master Marshall himselfe, who in not a few places, yea I may truly say all along, do in their framing answers to my written speeches, crook my words where they are streight, and they might have discerned them so to be, had their halt in publishing their answers permitted them to ponder my writings. As for instance: Master Marshall had averred that the Christian Church hath been in possession of Infant-baptisme for the space of 1500. yeares and upwards, I replied, that if it were true, yet it is not so much as may be said for Episcopacy, &c. And after, For antiquity not Apostolicall, there are plaine testimonies of Episcopacy, &c. being in use before any of the testimonies you or any other can produce for baptizing of Infants. Now M. Marshall in his Deterc., Pag. 78. First sets down my words thus, *As much may be said for Episcopacy, &c. That there are plaine testimonies, for Episcopacy &c. before any testimonies can be produced for the baptizing of Infants*, and then tels me, *that the Ancients testifie that the baptizing Infants was received in all ages, and from the very Apostles as a Divine Institution, no such thing of Episcopacy, if I can make it good, I shall do a very acceptable service to the Papists, Anabaptists, and Prelaticall party, if I cannot, I should do well to revoke that bold assercion.* In which Master Marshall deales not candidly with me, when I had said, *if it were true, yet it is not so much as may be said for Episcopacy*, (meaning that which he had said) *the Church hath been in possession of Infant-baptisme 1500. yeares and upwards*, Master Marshall sets down my words, as if I had said, *as much may be said for Episcopacy*, and in the latter passage leaves out the words [*Antiquity not Apostolicall*] and [being



[being in use] and then insinuates, as if I had asserted, that the Ancients say as much for the Divine Institution of Episcopacy as for Infant-baptisme. Whereas I only spake of the possession and being in use, nothing of the Divine Institution, and my assertion is so manifest, that even the advertisement at the end of the New Annot: on the Bible, confesseth it a custome very ancient, and neere the Apostles time, as Chamier truly acknowledge, Lib. 10. c. 6. de Oecumenico Pontifice, Tom. 2. Pag. 353. Molin in his Epistle to Bishop Andrewes, (if my memory deceive me not) confessed it to have been *ab ipsis Apostolorum temporibus*. And I conceive Master Marshalls leaving out in his proposition of the first part, [as now taught] which was in mine, and framing it thus, in opposition to mine [Infant-baptisme no late innovation] may occasion an unwary reader to conceive I had simply asserted it to be a late innovation. Now this course, though it may perhaps not prejudice my writings with those that are able and willing to take paines to compare together writing with writing, yet the greatest part either through want of leasure or skill, or through disaffection to me or mine opinion, or through a secure resting on Master Marshalls word neglecting it, it is a great injury to me, and to the Truth, As for Master Thomas Goodwins Sermons of Infant-baptisme, whether my censure of them, or Master Robert Bayly one of the Scottish Commissioners charge in his Dissuasive, Cha. 6. Pag. 119. do more disparage them or him, I leave it to Master Marshalls, Master Goodwins and their friends consideration. It hath been excepted against me that I say, Pag. 139. of my Examen, which if he can apply to Infants, *erit mihi magnus Apollo*, which is no worle then what Master Gataker hath animadv. in Luci: Part. 1. Sect. 8. Pag. 22. *Inter iustum & insontem qui distinctionem iustam dederit. erit is mihi magnus Apollo*: and that I have said Master Goodwin dictated at Bow, which is so harmelesse an expression, that even the preface to the new Annot: and the advertisement call their writings, their dictates.

Let us consider the scorn put upon Mr. Marshall. When I urged Mr. Gere in private conference to instance in particulars, wherein I had dealt courselly or sleighted my opponents, expecting he would have shewed me where I had falsified their words, or belyed, or derided their persons; instead of any such matter he

alleadgeth that passage, part 3. of my examination, pag. 36. of which Mr. Marshall, pag. 94 of his defence sayes, *This you cast away with scorne, affirming it to be an easie answer, because it is easie to be answered*; which possibly may be thought to have some lepidity (which is sure but a veniall sin in one tired, as I was with hewing at such a knotty piece as Mr. Marshalls Sermon) but how it should be a casting of scorne I see not. In the same place Mr. Marshall sayes, *I make my selfe merry with the word virtuall*, as if the examining the sense of a distinction, were making merry with it, pag. 103. He sayes, *I wonder you should seeke to cast an odium upon my expression (as you doe here, and severall other times) by saying it is a joyning with Arminius*. I answer, where I said he joynes with Arminius, I conceive still I said right; not to cast an odium upon his expressions, but to shew the error of them. And for that particular I charged Mr. Marshall with, in calling Profelytes, who sought justification by the works of the law *Abrahams seed*, he joynes with Arminius in his Analysis, c. 9. *ad Rom.* and opposeth Bayne, it was right. For Arminius saith, *Ratio est à duplice semine Abrahami, quorum unum tantum verbo isto & proposito comprehendatur. And this double seed of Abraham he calls the sons of promise, whom he defines, sunt illi qui fide in Christum justitiam & salutem quarunt, and the children of the flesh, whom he defines; qui per opera legis justitiam, & salutem consequuntur.* (I confesse it was in my copy through an easie, but not materiall oversight; *consequuntur*, yet in the English I render it, follow: but why this should puzzle Mr. Marshall I know not) And to this calling some *Abrahams seed*, who no otherwise were *Abrahams seed*, but in that they professing Judaisme, sought righteousness by the law, Bayne rightly opposeth that speech, that those that conceive carnally of the law seeking righteousness by it without something else adjoyned, to wit naturall generation; are never called *Abrahams seed*. Yet Mr. Marshall in his Sermon, and again in his defence, pag. 10. calls those *Abrahams seed*, who are not so by naturall generation, or by faith; but are Profelytes, seeking Justification by the works of the Law: Which is the very ground of Arminius his perverting the ninth of the Romans to maintain his opinion of respective Predestination. As for Master Marshall's vindication of himselfe, it goes upon this mistake, as if



if I had charged him with agreeing with *Arminius* in the expounding the ninth to the *Romans*, and in his opinion of election upon foreseen faith, whereas I only charged him with joyning with *Arminius* in this particular, to call the Profelytes that were Jewes by profession, but sought righteouſneſſe by the law, *Abrahams* ſeed; pag. 105. Mr. *Marshall* ſayes, that I try all my wits and artifices to ſhake the ſtrength of his ſecond concluſion by ſcornfull ſpeeches, &c. The truth is, I was put to the triall of all my wits to find out the meaning of his ſecond concluſion; but as for the ſtrength of it, it is ſo ſmall, that he that can but ſhew the ambiguity in it, may refute it without much adoe. As for the ſcornfull ſpeeches Mr. *Marshall* can find but one, which was the calling of his ſecond concluſion, a *Cothurnus*; which I never dream'd would have been taken for an expreſſion of ſcorne, but a proverbiall phraſe ſignifying an ambiguous ſpeech uſed by *David Pareus* in his judgement on the 5 Articles ſent to the Synod of *Dort*, and by others the moſt grave, and ſolid Divines. I ſaid, pag. 54. That Mr. *Marshall* did very carnally imagine the Church of God to be like civill corporations, this he calls pag. 121. a ſcornfull puffe, but why he ſhould call it ſo, I am yet to ſeeke. pag. 124. he ſayes, that I ſleight and ſcorn that which I know not how to answer, but it would be hard for Mr. *Marshall* to verify this in any particular; pag. 133. he calls the uſe of the word *Coccyſme* very frequent among Schollars, and of the ſame meaning with *Exambe* uſed by Mr. *Marshall*, pag. 256. a ſcornfull expreſſion; and becauſe I ſay, pag. 63. of my Examen, your argument needs a ſummer of *Delos* to bring it out of the deep, this he calls pag. 134. my method to caſt a ſcorn upon an argument, which is only the uſing a proverbiall ſpeech uſed by *Spanheimius* in his *dubia Evangelica*, and others concerning a thing that there is need of ſkill to find it out, pag. 162. 163. in anſwering the argument brought to prove that holineſſe, 1 Cor. 7. 14. is not federal Mr. *Marshall* ſayes. All the reply you make to it, pag. 80. is to beſtow a few ſcoffes upon it; that my answer is to deny the concluſion, that I ſhew no faultineſſe either in the matter, or the forme of the argument, that the ſcope that I mention is but a meer ſigment; that I doe as good as ſay that the object our can make no argument out of it, and that therefore I need make no answer. And that in one place I grant the minor, then the major;

*An Apologie for the two Treatises*

major; and thus you most gallantly vapour upon me: and after, I durst leave all Schollers to judge, whether my answer deserves all this scorne; and after, you thought to carry it with more advantage to you by scoffing, then by solemn refuting; and after. Truly Sir, I am perswaded all learned men either laugh at, or pity this vanity of your disputing; and pag. 164 not once suspecting I should have met with an adversary so uningenious to say no worse, who would have said the balking of this question, had been the yeelding of the cause. To all this I reply, that my words are misrecited by Mr. Marshall. I did not say, his answer is to deny the conclusion, but thus, I find no answer to the argument here, except it be an answer to an argument to deny the conclusion. Nor doe I say, that the baulking of the question, whether the beleever, when he commits fornication with an infidell, remove the barre in the unbelieving party, as that the child is (in the beleiving parents right) to be reckoned to belong to the covenant of Grace, and Church of God, had been the yeelding of the Cause, which he makes my uningenuity. 2. The passages only taxe a defect in Logick in Mr. Marshall in that place, but doe indeed containe neither matter of scorn, nor gallant vapouring. 3. And however learned men pittie or laugh at the vanity of my disputing, I doubt not to make it appeare; that neither Mr. Marshall nor Mr. Gere have yet made an answer to that argument, which doth overthrow his exposition of federall holinesse, that though Mr. Gere sayes there was *ignoratio Elenchi*, yet indeed there is no *ignoratio Elenchi*, the thing being concluded that was to be concluded; and whereas Mr. Marshall first new makes the major, and then denies it, he deales not rightly in putting in words to anothers argument, and yet the major is rather true with his addition, and then Mr. Marshall puts a minor of his owne; and denies it. But the truth is, the argument should be thus framed: That holinesse which might be though one of the Parents, were not sanctified to the other, is not here meant; but federall holinesse might be, though one of the Parents were not sanctified to the other. Ergo, Federall holinesse is not here meant; or thus, that uncleannesse which doth not agree to all the children of those whose Parents are not sanctified one in or to another, is not here meant: but federall uncleannesse doth not agree to all the children of those whose Parents are not sanctified one in or to another; Ergo, Federall uncleannesse is not there



*here meant.* But these things I reserve till I review the dispute about the meaning of 1 Cor. 7. 14 concerning which I doubt not, but if God spare me life and liberty I shall make good my argument, and answer *Mr. Marshall's* exceptions, yea and further shew, that if the sanctification and holincsse be taken from the faith of one party, and not from the relation of husband and wife; the Apostles reason as they expound it, would have served to resolve two fornicatours whereof one is a beleever, the other remaining in infidelity; that they may live together as well as two married persons. pag. 10. I said, surely this is a shewd signe that you are not likely to make good your ground, when you have yeelded so much: this he calls pag. 195. an idle scoffe, though in it there is nothing like a scoffe. pag. 113. I say. But your fetching such a compasse about, makes me imagine your attempt will prove but a parturiunt montes, the mountaines bring forth. This *Mr Marshall* calls a jeere, and a confident scoffe, and I confesse this carries the shew of a jeere, when the other part of the verse is added; but I left it out of purpose, that it might not be so taken; conceiving *Mr. Marshall* would have construed it (as even grave Scholars use it) to signify an attempt that is faire in shew, but vaine in the issue. pag. 122. I say of *Mr. Marshall's* consequence which he called undeniable and clear, thus: if you apprehend clear consequences in it, you may enjoy your conceit; nos non sumus adeo sagaces, we are not so quick mitted; this *Mr. Marshall* sayes, pag. 208. is to seek to render an adversary ridiculous, by jeeres and scoffes. But the truth is that was not mine intent, but the griefe of my spirit when I wrote this, being then rejected by *Mr. Marshall* in the busines of the Temple, being told that it was the Assemblies rule not to nominate any to a place in the ministry that questioned the baptizing of infants, pinched with the sadnesse of my condition, and considering how the Magistrate was incited against such as could not subscribe to *Mr. Marshall's* judgement, upon his reasons which he called undeniable, an indignation that men should be undone for not assenting to so poore proofes, made me after I saw my exertation stirred not to use that quicknesse in those expressions; which I am perswaded, had I not done, the point would not have been examined by them to this day: p. 122. *Mr Marshall* sayes, your answer is a scoffe out of Horace, Amphora cepit instrui,

&c. which is no scoffe, but a speech often in the writings of Scholars, used to signify, that one falls short of that he should prove. pag. 164. I speak of *Mr Marshalls* discourse about Gods dealing conditionally to infants, & their after agnizing thus. *And therefore this that you make an objection I look on as a frivolous supposing a Chimera, and then disputing about it.* This *Mr Marshall* calls a scoffe. But what is more usuall with Schollars, then to call a fiction a Chimera, without the imputation of scoffing? And these are all the supposed scoffes against *Mr Marshall*, that I find noted by him. Now that it may appeare how unequally *Mr Marshall* deales with me, (that I mention no other) that most accurate and grave writer *Mr Gataker* in a little thing containing but 60 pages, in a full letter intituled *Antithesis*, in answer to two Protestants godly men, and as eminent as *Mr Marshall*; Doctor *Ames* an English-man Professor of Divinity at *Franker* in *Westfriesland*, and *Gisbert Voetius* Professour of *Vtrecht*, about *Lusory* lois: hath these passages; pag. 6. *Sibylla quod fertur folium: sed quod nisi sibylla nobis explicuerit interpretaturum alium credo autore dempto neminem*, pag. 16. *cum absurditas illius detecta plane jam fuerit & revera defensoribus suis* *id est* *pag. 17. quam involuta tandem ista? &c.* de sensu si ambigimus, condonabit nobis spero, *Amesius*; neque enim hebetioris paulo ingenii qui sumus ista facile assequimur, pag. 20. *verum ista prout & superiora pleraque in illis & istis* *id est* *pag. 21. nam quae sequuntur mihi enigmata sunt mera, & Sphingo vel Oedipo opus habent*, pag. 22. *nam quae sequuntur non sunt nauci*, pag. 22. *neque enim perspicue loqui amat Amesius*; sed angillarum in morem ambigua locutionis cane sua involvere & occultare solent habet, pag. 24. *nam in testimonio illius, quod plurimum in hac causa, ponderis obtinet interpretatione, nec ut agis praestigias*; eaque proponit, quae sibi invicem adversantur, &c. pag. 27. *verum pronuntiata ista quae ex hic positis tamen profluant, sunt ab omni sensu humano prorsus aliena.* Ita levior deprehenditur ratiuncula ista, quae pro argumento tamen *Achilleo* ac palmario proponitur, quod sunt ipsa farsari folia, pag. 31. *quam imbellem acolumbo plane argumentum, & viro tanto prorsus indignum.* Ecquis tam vocat ut ista admittat? pag. 31. *quod teneam vultum mutantem Proteum modo*, pag. 33. *vanitas illas potius incuset Amesius, qui tam vana mihi eggerant, sed etiam qui adversus istud obiecta: au-*  
gam



*nam adversus illud opposita proponit; tum consecrationibus in suo cerebro confictis elidendis negotium sibi frustra facessit, pag. 34. cum aliorum, tum & Amesii etiam ipsius dogma futile, pag. 46. quorum ille quasdam tanquam cramben toties recoctam reponit, pag. 48. affirmatur non probatur, quasi Pythagoricum illud idem ipse sufficeret.* Which passages as I conceive no man ever charged with scoffing, to neither doe I conceive justly might mine, which shew no more sleighting or contempt of my opponents then his doe.

But pag. 94. of my Examen I say, the misunderstanding of Col. 2. 11. 12. hath been the Ignis fatuus, foolish fire, which hath led men out of the way in this matter into bogs. Upon this Mr Marshall pag. 179. thus speaks to me. Truly sir, were these scorns of being led by foolish fire into bogs &c. cast upon my selfe only, it were nothing; but when they are thus cast in the faces of all Divines, ancient and modern, all Harmonies and Confessions (except onely a handfull of upstart Anabaptists), as if they were all such simple ones that an ignis fatuus, a fools fire might lead them into any bog; I can hardly forbear to tell you: it is an argument of an arrogant spirit.

I pity Mr Marshall's distemper, that occasioned this passage, to speak of casting scornes in the faces of all Divines ancient and modern, as if all Divines did expound that text, in that misunderstood way I mention; to talke of all Harmonies and Confessions, instead of the Harmony of confessions, which containes not many; and one I am sure it is not against, to wit the English confession: to speak disdainfully of them that are his opponents under the term of upstart Anabaptists, to make the using of the term ignis fatuus, to resemble a misunderstanding, a scuffle; to impute it to me as if I had accused all Divines ancient and modern, all Harmonies and Confessions of simplicity, as if a misunderstanding might not be in all men out of common infirmity, to impute it to me as if I had said into any bogs, whereas I said, hath led men out of the way in this matter into bogs meaning the opinions; that Baptisme succeeds into the place, room, and use of Circumcision: and therefore that the command to circumcise male infants at the eighth day, is a command to baptize any infants of believers at any time, which errors I call bogs, as being indeed Anti-evangelicall errors: though all the Divines on earth should avouch them, yet this I may say without arrogance of Spirit, in just and

&c. which is no scoffe, but a speech often in the writings of Scholars, used to signify, that one falls short of that he should prove. pag. 164. I speak of *Mr Marshalls* discourse about Gods dealing conditionally to infants, & their after agnizing thus. *And therefore this that you make an objection I looke on as a frivolous supposing a Chimæra, and then disputing about it.* This *Mr Marshalls* calls a scoffe. But what is more usuall with Schollars, then to call a fiction on a Chimæra, without the imputation of scoffing? And these are all the supposed scoffes against *Mr Marshall*, that I find noted by him. Now that it may appeare how unequally *Mr Marshall* deales with me, (that I mention no other) that most accurate and grave writer *Mr Gataker* in a little thing containing but 60 pages, in a full letter intituled *Antithesis*, in answer to two Protestants godly men, and as eminent as *Mr Marshall*; Doctor *Ames* an English-man Professor of Divinity at *Francker* in *Westfriesland*, and *Gisbert Voetius* Professour of *Vtrecht*, about *Lusory lers*: hath these passages, pag. 6. *Sibyllæ quod fertur folium: sed quod nisi sibylla nobis explicuerit interpretaturum alium credo autore dempto neminem*, pag. 16. *cum absurditas illius detecta plane jam fuerit & revera defensoribus suis* *ἡλικία μὲν οὐκ ὀλιγοναία*, pag. 17. *quam involuta tandem ista?* &c, de sensu si ambigimus, condonabit nobis spero, *Amesius*; neque enim hebetioris paulo ingenii quia sumus ista facile assequimur, pag. 20. *verum ista prout & superiora plærage* *ἡλικία ἡ ἰδίῃ ὥσιν*, pag. 21. *nam quæ sequuntur mihi enigmata sunt mera, & Sphinge vel Oedipo opus habent*, pag. 22. *nam quæ sequuntur non sunt nauci*, pag. 22. *neque enim perspicue loqui amat Amesius*; sed anguillarum in morem ambigua locutionis cæno sua involvere & occultare solenne habet, pag. 24. *nam in testimonio illius, quod plurimum in hac causa, ponderis obtinet interpretatione, meras agis prestigias*; eaque proponis, quæ sibi invicem adversantur, &c. pag. 27. *verum pronuntiata ista quæ ex hic positis tamen profluunt, sunt ab omni sensu humano prorsus aliena. Ita levior deprehenditur ratiuncula ista, quæ pro argumento tamen Achilleo ac palmario proponitur, quàm sunt ipsa farfari folia*, pag. 31. *quàm imbelles ac elumbe planè argumentum, & viro tanto prorsus indignum. Ecquis tam vecors ut ista admittat?* pag. 32. *quod teneam vultus mutantem Protea modo*, pag. 33. *vanitatis illos potius incuset Amesius, qui tam vana nobis oggesserunt, seque etiam quia adversus istud objecta tan-*  
*quam*



quam adversus illud opposita proponit ; tum consecutionibus è suo cerebro confictis elidendis negotium sibi frustra facessit, pag. 34. cum aliorum, tum & Amesii etiam ipsius dogma futile, pag. 46. quorum ille quosdam tanquam cramben toties recoctam reponit, pag. 48. affirmatur non probatur, quasi Pythagoricum illud divi iqr. sufficeret. Which passages as I conceive no men ever charged with lcomfing, to neither doe I conceive justly might mine, which shew no more sleighting or contempt of my opponents then his doe.

But pag. 94. of my Examen I say, the misunderstanding of Col. 2. 11. 12. hath been the Ignis fatuus, foolish fire, which hath led men out of the way in this matter into bogs. Upon this Mr Marshall pag. 179. thus speaks to me. Truly sir, were these scorns of being led by foolish fire into bogs &c. cast upon my selfe only, it were nothing; but when they are thus cast in the faces of all Divines, ancient and modern; all Harmonies and Confessions (except onely a handfull of upstart Anabaptists) as if they were all such simple ones that an ignis fatuus, a fools fire might lead them into any bogs; I can hardly forbear to tell you: it is an argument of an arrogant spirit.

I pittie Mr Marshall's distemper, that occasioned this passage, to speak of casting scornes in the faces of all Divines ancient and modern, as if all Divines did expound that text, in that misunderstanding way I mention; to talke of all Harmonies and Confessions, instead of the Harmony of confessions, which containes not many; and one I am sure it is not against, to wit the English confession: to speak disdainfully of them that are his opponents under the term of upstart Anabaptists, to make the using of the term ignis fatuus, to resemble a misunderstanding, a scoffe; to impute it to me as if I had accused all Divines ancient and modern, all Harmonies and Confessions of simplicity; as if a misunderstanding might not be in all men out of common infirmity, to impute it to me as if I had said into any bogs, whereas I said, hath led men out of the way in this matter into bogs, meaning the opinions; that Baptisme succeeds into the place, room, and use of Circumcision: and therefore that the command to circumcise male infants at the eighth day, is a command to baptize any infants of beleivers at any time; which errors I call bogs, as being indeed Anti-evangelicall errors: though all the Divines on earth should avouch them, yet this I may say without arrogance of Spirit, in just and

necessary avouching of the truth. That reverend and learned Divine Mr Gataker in his answer to Mr George Walkers vindication, pag. 133. Sayesthus. *Howsoever I suppose it no such hainous matter in something to depart from all writers knowne to us, that have gone before us. Sure I am that Junius and Tremellius in translating and expounding some passages of Scripture, departed from all known Interpreters that had gone before them, as in that place, Mal. 2. 16. that in all, even the best translations ever before ran; if thou, hate her, put her away. Pareus Comment: in 1 Cor. 1. 12. miror verò hoc loco omnes fore interpretes fictionem statuere. I might fill a volume with interpretations different from all foregoing; yea, what interpreter of note is there who doth not differ from all others, and yet it is not counted arrogance? Besides, if this be not allowed upon cogent reason, how shall Scriptures and Truths be cleared? How shall we avoyd idolizing of them that goe before us, and subjecting our judgments to them? And that I spake right, it may appeare in that, in the principall thing of my exposition of Colos. 2 11. 12. to wit, that Baptisme is mentioned not to shew that it succeeds Circumcision, but because it is one of the means whereby we have communion with Christ, and are compleat in him, and therefore Faith is joyned with Baptisme, and alleaged to prove it; Gal. 3. 25, 26, 27. (not as in Mr Marshall's defence, Gal. 5. 25, 26.) and Rom. 6. 3, 4, 5. which plainly shewes that here Baptisme is not mentioned to that end Mr Marshall expresth, & upon which the misunderstanding of this place was occasioned, but to another; and therefore it proves not that which Mr Marshall would gather from it; if it did, it would prove that faith succeeds into the roome place, and use of Circumcision as well as Baptisme. To this Mr Marshall plainly sayes, But is not this the same sense with mine. But he after spends a great many words to no purpose (as he is wont to doe when he mistakes my reason) imagining I had reasoned thus. Baptisme is named as one of the means whereby we come to be compleat in Christ, therefore it doth not succeed in the room of circumcision, whereas my reason is thus. Baptisme is alleaged as one of the means whereby we come to be compleat in Christ, therefore there was another reason besides the succession of it into the place of Circumcision, why the Apostle there mentions it, which Mr Marshall denied; which reason is good, except*

Of the exposition I give of Colos. 2 12. Confessed to be right by Mr Marshall himselfe.



except it were true, that every meanes whereby we are compleat in Christ, succeeds Circumcision, the contrary whereof is confessed by Mr Marshall in acknowledging faith to bee one of the means whereby we are compleat in Christ, which yet succeeds not Circumcision: many more such mistakes in Doctor *Homes*, Mr *Geree*, and Mr *Marshall*, I may hereafter shew; I thought it best however God deale with me to cleare my selfe in this, and to take notice of this concession, which with others I may improve to overthrow all Mr *Marshall's* dispute. But it is arrogance to deny that which all reformed Churches teach, that our Baptisme succeeds into the place, roome, and use of the Jewes Circumcision.

To this I answer: 1. I know not that all the reformed Churches teach this, I remember not where this Doctrine is determined in the Church of Englands publique Doctrinals. 2. Master *Garaker* in his Postscript to Master *Worons* Defence, saith thus, *That justification consists in remission of sin, for my part I deem erroneous, and suppose that elsewhere I have evidently shewed it so to be; howbeit Calvin, Beza, Olevian, Ursin, Zanchi, Piscator, Pareus, Musculus, Bullinger, Fox, and divers others of great note, and name, yea whole Synods of ours are found so to say, and yet I never heard this charged for arrogancy on him.* And for the assertions I impugne, that Baptisme comes in the place, roome, and use of Circumcision, and that this may be proved from *Colos. 2. 11, 12.* though Master *Marshall* hold his rod over me, saying, *I can hardly forbear to tell you it is an argument of an arrogant spirit,* I feare not yet to call them an ignis fatuus that leaden men out of the way in this matter into bogs. To conclude my answer to this charge of scoffing, I do the lesse marvaile that it is my lot to be thus charged, when Mr *Geree* in his *vindicie paedobaptismi*, Pag. 66, 67. calls one free speech very necessary of Master *Ralph Cudworth* a man so approved, as by Ordinance of Parliament constituted Master of a Houle in Cambridge, a quipping passage, carrying an impression of a satyricall spirit against our reverend Divines, to be checked, abhorred, not countenanced. And I say further that if my memory do not deceive me, there are passages in *Smectymnus*, that carry as much shew of irony as mine do, towards a man for age, and learning not inferiour to Master *Marshall*, and therefore I suppose my words, which are usuall among Scholars, might have had a more favourable construction. I am bold to

make use of Master Gatakers words to Lucius, Part. ult. Sect. 8. Pag, 91. *Stomacho nimium qdm indulget vir Cl: superciliosius nimis alte attollit, qd tam agre fert placita sua circa ullam vel censoria magistratus, vel censura magistratus volam aut vestigium eis formulis quibus apud in scholis disceptantes nihil est videri negari, idque cum negationis rationes adiectas aut videt aut videre si velit queat.* Nevertheless I professe freely, that had I dreamed such expressions so usuall in Scholastick disputes would have been so taken, I would for avoyding of offence have abstained from them.

## §. 6.

Of the clearing the Author of the Examen from either justifying the Anabaptists in Germany, or condemning the godly, and grave Non-conformists in England.

There is another charge against me that sticks deeper then the former, and it is this: Master Marshall in his Sermon had mentioned the *Anabaptists as a dangerous and turbulent sect, working a world of mischief about Munster, and other parts of Germany.* This relation I conceived to be used, not only to Magistrates to make them wary to prevent the like, but also in all sorts of Auditories, with much ingemination to make the persons that question the baptizing of Infants odious, and unsufferable in a Christian Commonwealth, and to stop mens eares against such evidence as may cleare the truth in this matter. To this therefore, as being an objection in the mouth of all sorts of men against the Antipædo-baptists, I thought it best to answer: 1. By granting much of the relation to be true, though perhaps vehemency of opposition hath made matters more, or worse then they were, as it is wont to be in such cases. To this Master Marshall saies, that he is confident I shew more good will to the Anabaptists, then intend ill will against those worthy men who have written these stories. I do take with the right hand this charitable opinion in Master Marshall of my intentions, and I plainly reply, that the truth is, that I did use thole words, neither out of partiall good will to the one, nor partiall ill will to the other, but out of a desire to remove that prejudice, which hindered men from examining the Truth. As for the men I abhorre the wicked practises of the one, yea so much the more I abhorre the practises of them that would so solemnly by baptism engage themselves to be Christ Disciples, and yet act such monstrous villanies, as having learned that the more profession a man makes of holinesse, the more accursed is his wickednesse; and for the other, I beare as much good will to the memory of them, as if they had agreed with me in opinion. I hope I shall



shall never make agreement with me in opinion, the reason or rule of my love, but relation to Jesus Christ, appearing in holinesse of life. Master *Marshall* saies, that the things are not to be questioned, and that he thinks that I am the first of our Divines who have suspected them to overlash in their relations. To this I say, my words are plaine, that much of this is true I make no question, meaning the maine of the relations, that the men denied baptizing of Infants, and that they brake out into such turbulent practices as are related of them. That which I added though perhaps vehemency of opposition hath made matters more, or worse then they were, as it is wont to be in such cases, meaning this, of some particular circumstances in some persons, was not because I suspected the overlash of the Historians, as if they wanted fidelity, but because many things were brought to the publike knowledge by the Bishop and Canons of *Munster*, their partisans who were Papists, and would aggravate all things to the most to make the *Lutheran* Reformation become odious; as *Strudley* did in the accident of *Enoch ap Evan* killing his mother and brother, or else by captives or desertors, who for favour or mercy would frame their tales, as they conceived might further their ends, and because experience of the uncertainty of the manner of carrying things in our times, hath made me speake warily concerning things past. And to speake plainly, when I consider what *Hooker* relates out of *Guy de Bres* of the seeming holinesse of the generality of them, their Orthodox confession at first mentioned by Master *Marshall* from Master *Dury* his knowledge, the proceedings and parts of *Bernardus Rotmannus* and some others, the things mentioned by my Examen, Part. 2. Sect. 3. the testimonies of *Gualter*, and *Cassander*, that the commotions in *Germany* began from oppression in the State, that *Luther* wrot to the Germane Princes against their oppressions, the strange spirit of *Lutherans* ever since, and the wofull tragedies of *Germany* in this last age, I do count the story of the Anabaptists to containe in it many things, the true reasons of which, and the true knowledge of the circumstances concerning them will not appeare till the day of the revelation of the righteous judgement of God. 2. I assigned some possible meanes of the turbulent carriages, and errors of the Anabaptists, beside their opinion of Antipædobaptisme. To which Master *Marshall* saies, he can hardly guesse

## An Apologie for the two Treatises

guesse whether I intended to excuse the Anabaptists in part, or to  
 blame the Reformed Churches for not hearing them, or to hint it as  
 a warning to our selves. I answer, I did it to shew there might be  
 other reasons of those tumults and divisions that the Anabaptists  
 fell into, then the opinion of Antipædobaptisme; sundry of which,  
 if not all I think happened in their case. Master Marshall saies, he  
 never read that they sought Reformation in a regular way, or were  
 denied it, before they fell into those furies. How farre they sought it  
 I cannot tell, it is plaine that Carlostadius and Pelargus, and some  
 say Melancthon would have reformed it in Saxony, had not Lu-  
 thers pertinacy in that as well as Consubstantiation, and Images  
 withstood it; and how Baltazar Huebner sought it at Zurich,  
 and was denied, it, is known. I thinke the Reformed Churches  
 have been to blame, and so may be our present Reformers, that  
 they have never yeelded to reforme it in a regular way; and if  
 Anabaptists have never sought it afore me, it hath been it's likely,  
 because they law mens spirits so bent against them, that they  
 thought it in vaine, yea they have beene rather forced to  
 conceale themselves, it having beene accounted criminall, justly  
 deserving excommunication, deprivation, and sometimes death, so  
 much as to question it. And that the Anabaptists have been so cast  
 out and rendered odious as they have been hath been the reason  
 why they have been forced to become a Sect (which I do not  
 iustifie) and by reason thereof, factious spirits have joyned with  
 them, and perverted them with other errors, which perhaps had  
 not happened, had thay been more tenderly and considerately  
 handled at first. 3. I said, but have not the like of the same things  
 happened in other matters? Did not the like troubles happen in  
 Queen Elizabeths daies, in seeking to remove Episcopacy and Cere-  
 monies? To this Master Marshall saith, The rest of that Section, is  
 to me extreemely scandalous, when I read your odious comparisons  
 between the Non-conformists in Queene Elizabeths daies, and the  
 Anabaptists in Germany; it even grieves me to consider, whether  
 affection to your cause doth carry you. And Master Gorse not only  
 Pag. 70. of his *Vindiciae paedobaptismi*, wonders at me that I should  
 compare the troubles of the Non-conformists, and the Anabaptists,  
 and marvels such an uncharitable and unjust thought should arise  
 in me, that divisions or other miscarriages of the Non-conformists  
 should



should bring them low in England: And beside all this, Master Geree publisheth a single sheet in print, and it came to my knowledge first by one that carried it about with other news Books, and this Paper he styles *the Character of an old Puritan or Non-conformist*, and in the end saith thus: *Reader seeing a passage in Master Tombes his book against Pædobaptisme, wherein he compares the Non-conformists in England, to the Anabaptists in Germany, in regard of their miscarriages and ill success in their endeavours still of late yeares, I was moved for the vindication of those faithfull, and reverend witnesses of Christ, to publish this character.* In which Mr Geree plainly intinuates, that I acculed those faithfull witnesses of Christ, whom he calls elsewhere the grave, godly, learned and unblameable Non-conformists in England. To answer this objection, I say that I never had a thought by those words *Did not divisions and other miscarriages and persecutions, bring the Non-conformists of England as low as the Anabaptists in Germany?* To accule thole men he names of such miscarriages. I honour the memory of Cartwright, Brightman, Hilderham, Parker, Dod, Bradshaw, and the rest of the same stamp as godly, learned, unblameable and faithfull servants of Christ. But I said *some there were that in seeking to remove Episcopacy and ceremonies, did by their divisions,* meaning thole of Browne, Barrow, and others, and *other miscarriages,* meaning of the writers of the Books called *Martin Marprelate*, and the like, the miscarriages of Hacker and his companions, the Prelates taking hold thereof to accuse them as seditious, and to incense the Queen and State against them with persecution bring them as low as the Anabaptists in Germany. And I said that *the like if not the same troubles happened here in England as in Germany,* meaning not in the degree, but in the kind, not in the fruit, but in the seed, which if the prudence of the State here had not timely prevented, (which could not be so well done in Germany, by reason of so many petty free States) might have broken out into as great a flame, as thole combustions in Germany. In which my intent was not to discredit Bullinger, Sleidan, Calvin, &c. nor to justify in the least manner the Anabaptists wicked practices, but only to shew that in seeking to reforme an abuse, there may happen such miscarriages and divisions, by the Devils stirring up some factious and hypocritical spirits of thole that joyne with the

seekers of Reformation, to breake out into hainous enormities of purpose to stop mens mouthes from speaking for, and mens eares from hearing of Truth. And therefore all that love the Truth, though they have reason to suppress those turbulent spirits, and take heed of mens heady advices though for a good end, yet they should not yeeld to the Devill so much as to permit him by the clamours against those factious spirits, to cheat them of the Truth, or to make them lesse, but rather more zealous for it. And that this was my meaning, had my words been either well heeded, or candidly construed, might have been perceived by them. Here I wish Master Gere to consider whether it were agreeable to *that friendship he acknowledgeth to have been between us, without any violating of it on my part, to publish such an unjust charge against me, and so to lay more burdens on my backe, after I told him he had not dealt kindly nor rightly with me in his Epistle Dedicatory to a Peere of the Realme in aspersing me, whereby I might suffer much and never be heard speak for my self, & yet never once aske me, though he had twice conference with me, once a little before his Book was published, the other, the same day it was put forth, whom I meant in those passages. I may well take up that speech of Absalom to Hushai, Is this thy kindnesse to thy friend?* Now from that which hath been said, it will be easie to answer Master Marshal's Quæres. *The Anabaptists in Germany rose up, and with fire and sword pulled down Magistracy, Schooles, &c. did she like, if not the same things happen here?* Tis true the Bores or Countrey people over all Germany did such things, and among them were those that they called *Anabaptists*, but these things were done by others then *Anabaptists*, and in some places where it doth not appeare to me that any such were: the cause of which was pretended the oppressions of the people by the Princes, but in Truth, their desire to plunder, and spoyle. Now though the seekers of the removall of Episcopacy, and Ceremonies, did not the same things in degree, yet they did such seditious things as were of the same kind, and tended to them, as inciting against the Magistrates, such invectives against Schooles, as had they not been withstood, might have produced the same effects, of which you may see passages out of *Barrow in Master Baylies Dissuasive*, Chap. 4. And I pray God we never find by experience, that discontented Presbyterians



terians can act the like things for their Presbytery, that Anabaptists did for their Anabaptism. Mr Marshall saith, *what did the Non-conformists ever endeavour to do beyond prayers and tears?* If M. Marshall mean by non-conformists such as M. Geree describes in his Character, I have nothing to accuse them, but if he mean by Non-conformists those that sought to remove Episcopacy and Ceremonies (which was my phrase, knowing that in procelle of time the terme Non-conformists was contradistinguished to Separatists) some of them used railing against men in place & authority, witness the Libels of Martin Marprelate, and such like in too great abundance, some of them, if Camden relate true in his *Annals of Elizabeth ad Annum 1591.* either conspired with, or some way animated Hacket, upon conceite that he was an extraordinary person raised by God to bring in the Discipline. Master Marshall saies *what turbulent Sect was ever among them,* my words were, *Did not some of them that sought to remove Episcopacy and Ceremonies, grow a dangerous and turbulent Sect?* Which words of mine are true in the followers of Browne, Barrow, &c. whom I thinke Mr Marshall will not deny to have been a dangerous and turbulent Sect, and they were at first a part of them that sought to remove Episcopacy and Ceremonies. He askes, *what were those divisions and miscarriages which brought them so low?* I had said, *Did not divisions and other miscarriages and persecutions bring the Non-conformists of England as low as the Anabaptists?* The divisions I meant, were those that were between the Separatists and other Non-conformists, the miscarriages I meant, were those of Martin Marprelate, Barrow, Hacket, and others which did incite Queene Elizabeth and the State against them, to arme the Bishops with their power, by which they did persecute them. Dr Iohn Burges rejoinder, Chap. 2. Sect. 11. Page 215. *For my part I thinke that the violence of some manner men against those things, hath caused the sharper execution of Lawes against some other men of worth. Crudelem medicum intemperans ager facit.* Master Marshall toucheth the story of Hacket and his companions and then saith: *But what is this to your purpose? what had Hacket to do with the Non-conformists, who you know (if ever you read the story) abominated him, and would have nothing to do with him even before he fell into those pranks he plaid in London?* I answer, I have read the story of Hacket in Camdens *Annals of*

Queen Elizabeth ad annum 1591. in Saravia against Beza de *diversis ministrorum graibus*, in *Stow* and *Howe*, and I do not find by these that the seekers to remove Episcopacy did abominate him as you say, but that *Wigginton* a Minister, and others of that party did either conspire with him, or otherwise encourage him upon the hope they had, that by him the Discipline should be promoted, and I find many practises like those of *John of Leyden* at *Munster*, as the pretending of revelations, affecting anointing as a King, commanding his Prophets *Arkington* and *Coppinger* to go into the City and preach, exciting the people against the Archbishop and Lord Chancellor, yea I find *Hacker's* end to have been worse in a more horrible manner than that of *John of Leyden*: nor do I doubt had *London* been in the same state as *Munster* was, but the Tragedy would have been as bad in the seeking to remove Episcopacy and Ceremonies, as it was in seeking to remove Pædobaptisme. And if the Non-conformists did abominate *Hacker*, so did the Anabaptists that followed *Mennon*, the *Munster*, and *Batenburgick*, furies. And as for the parallel I brought out of *Whitgift* and *Hooker*, I did it not to justify their charges against the Non-conformists, but to shew that they deprehended a likenesse of spirit & waies in some of the one, as well as the other. And my end in the whole was to shew, that in seeking to remove a reall error, and abuse, famous persons may fall into such miscarriages, and yet their miscarriages ought not to hinder the Reformation of the error or abuse, though these things may well be urged for caveats to Magistrates and people, to suppress & take heed of the seditious practises of such agents: which warning being rightly taken, is good and necessary, yea perhaps more necessary for these times then I at first imagined, and so needs not a *del. a ur.* but a right construction.

S. 7. Another charge Master *Ley*, and Master *Marshall* fasten upon me that I wrote my Treatises as a braving Goliath, so Master *Ley*, *ubi supra*: Master *Marshall* in his Defence, Pag. 2. And come into the field so bravely and gyantlike. Pag. 2 + 4. Truly Sir, thou smelst a little too rankely, thou confidently to challenge all men, not contented with Goliath to say, give me a man that I may fight with him, but to desire a whole host, argues a little too much selfe confidence: To which I answer If Master *Ley*, or Master *Marshall* either had allowed me so charitable an opinion, as my forepast life and actions might have induced

Of the clearing of the Author of the two Treatises from vaunting and challenging in the composing and publishing the Treatises.



induced them to have of me, or heeded my words in the *prologue* and *Epilogue* in my *Examen*, they would never have fastned this charge of a *braving* Goliath, or *confident* challenging or *defying* a whole host on me. For my bygone actions, they rather speake me a man willing to gratifie others, and to serve the common good, then to make ostentation of my selfe out of selfe confidence. There are many that can make report of my labours in the places where God hath disposed of me, there are none that can give one instance, wherein I have put my selfe forward to shew my parts either in Preaching the publike Sermons in the University, or at *Pauls*, or in great meetings in the Countrey, or before great men, or the Parliament, or the Armies, but what ever I have done upon any such occasions, necessity or conscience have induced me to it. And for my writings such as they are, setting aside the *Examen* and *Exercitation*, they carry their plea for them in their forehead. Infirmities I have, and those many, but sure the whole course of my actions are a plea for me against this imputation of a braving, challenging, vaunting humour: yea did not the mindfullnesse of my account to God, love to the soules of men, and the discharge of my duty, lead me into publique actions, I should rather embrace that advise, *benè qui latuit, benè vixit*. Certainly in this businesse, I was so farre from the braving humour, that, as may be perceived by the relation above, necessity engaged me to it, not selfe confidence, and an humour of ostentation. The truth is, there were other arguments that I had entered upon, before I was engaged in this matter, as namely against the mortality of the soule, universall grace, the Antinomian errors about justification, and justifying faith, and some since, as about the matter and forme of a particular visible Church, about the nature of Schisme and Heresie, in which I might safely have exercised such abilities as I have, if selfe ostentation had been my motive, and not have put my finger in this fire, durst I desert the Truth. But how uncharitably Master Ley, and Master Marshall do construe my action, I thinke it will presently appeare to him that shall read the *Prologue*, and *Epilogue* of my *Examen*, especially those speeches, wherein I declared my intentions to be either to rectifie Master Marshall, or to be rectified by him, that we might give one another the right hand of fellowship, and I pray that the Lord would vouchsafe to frame our spirits to seeke the

truth in humility and love, which might have given them cause to have conceived otherwise of my disposition, then they have done, except they judged my speech hypocritical, which I am sure would have been beyond their line to do. In the *Epilogue* I tell Master Marshall, that I examined his Sermon in the midst of many wants, distractions, discouragements, and temptations, which were indeed very many, so many that nothing but Gods assistance, and the thought of my account to God could, as then the case was with me, have carried me thorough the worke. I said that I knew no reason, why Master Marshall should conceive, that I had taken the paines to examine his Sermon for any ends crosse to the finding of Truth, I tell him plainly, my reall intention in this worke is to discover Truth, and to do what is meet for me in my calling, towards the Reformation of these Churches, according to Gods word, unto which we have both bound our selves by solemn Covenant. These words should have acquitted me from this charge of braving out of selfe confidence, if Master Marshall, or Master Ley knew nothing to the contrary, as I am sure they did not, and I thinke they have no prospective glasse to look into my brest. And for the words Mr Marshall saies, *small a little too rankely of challenging and disying a whole Host*, had he considered or recited the whole period, and not cut off my words in the midst, he had seen that my words were not a braving challenge, but a faire and most reasonable motion, to have some one Treatise framed by those that had appeared in publike, and whose writings or Sermons, I had endeavoured to answer, that I might know what they would stand to, and save my selfe the labour and charge of buying and reading every indigested Pamphlet. And after I made another motion, in case this was not liked, to have a meeting to consult about a way of brotherly and peaceable ventilating this point. The rejecting of both these motions by Master Marshall if they make him not inexcusable, yet I presume make my proceedings excusable, and his so palpable a misconstruction of my spirit in this matter, doth strongly argue that he looked on my writing with a bloodshot eye, however he protest the contrary in his Epistle Dedicatory to the Assembly. And I think he should not shoote very wide from the marke, that should imagine that these exceptions against the Author, are for want of a cleare answer to the Booke.

There



Of the clearing the Author of the two Treatises from Sophistry in them, whereby occasion is taken to vindicate the Treatises in many of the chiete things contained in them.

There is yet another charge against me that flies higher, and comes nearer to the matter, if it were true, and it is indeed (though they do not call it so) the deceit of Sophistry in my writing, which if it were so, were a damnable sin to pervert the Truth of God by such prophane handling. But let us consider what is said: Master Marshall Pag. 2. of his Defence, saith thus: *wherein I shall not (as you have done) carpe at every phrase or expression, nor digresse into impertinent discourses, thereby to swell up a volume, nor amuse the Reader with multitudes of quotations of Latin and Greeke Authors, and then turne them into English; nor frame as many senses of an expression as is possible, and then confute them, and so fight with men of straw, of mine own setting up: nor spend a whole sheet of paper together, in confuting what was never intended by my adversary, as the Reader shall clearly perceive you have dealt with me.*

In answer hereto, I say: The first charge is so ranke, that unlesse he meane by *carping* something else then I conceive, to wit a wanton, unnecessary, quarrelling, or excepting without cause, it is so palpable an untruth, that I wonder he would let it fall from his pen, unlesse he wrote at adventure. I do sometimes (and yet not so frequently as there was occasion) declare the ambiguity and unfitnesse of some expressions, but never without reason, out of a carping humour: much lesse *carpe at every phrase or expression*. And for the second, it is true, I do make some digressions, and so did Doctor John White in his way to the true Church, Doctor Twisse in his *Provincie* against Arminius, but these digressions I am sure are all most pertinent, and necessary to a full discussion of the argument in hand, *not to swell up a volume*, but to clear the Truth. The third charge is as vaine, for the quotations are not multitudes, nor so many as that praise-worthy writer Master Gataker, methinks of them unnecessary, not for amusing the Reader but for confirmation of my Tenets, and the turning them into English I should thinke was no fault, unlesse he could have proved I either misquoted or mistranslated, which I thinke in any thing of weight he cannot do. Yet I acknowledge that in my *Examen*, Part. 1. Sect. 8. Page 13. I did say *Peter de Brui* did appeale to the Greeke Church, thinking the words *being himselfe a Latine*, ignorant of Greeke had been spoken of *Petrus de Brui*, but it seems *Petrus Cumiaceus* speakes

speakes it of himselfe, and I there through mistake of memory put [Arles] for [Orange] a City neare it. And these I thanke Doctor *Homes* for advertizing me of: and shall be willing to confesse any other oversights, that no reader may be deceived by me: though for the present I know no other. Doctor *Homes* names some other, yet I conceive wrongfully. As for the framing of as many senses of an expression as is possible, and then confusing them, this I thought had been a vertue in disputing to find out the many senses of an expression, and to confute them. I ever tooke this good arguing; if the conclusion be true, then in this or that sence, but in none of all these it is true, ergo it is not true: and that this had not been fighting with men of straw, but fighting with the strongest enemy that was in the field.

§. 9.  
Of the meaning of Master *Marshalls* second conclusion, the words in the *Declaration*. [the promise is made to Beleevers and their seed] and the Doctrine therein delivered, disavowed by Mr *Marshall* and Mr. *Geree*.

The last charge is, that I spend a whole sheet of paper in confusing what was never intended by him: be it so; yet if the Reader were likely to take it so, it was fit it should be refuted, and himselfe blamed for speaking no plainer, but leading his Reader and Answerer out of the way, by the ambiguity of his expression. But to examine this charge more fully: He meanes I assure my selfe the refuting of this conclusion Exam. Part. 3. Sect. 4. from Pag. 48. to 54. (which comes short of a whole sheet) That the Covenant of saving grace in Christ. expressed in Gen. 7. 7. in these words [I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed] is made to beleevers and their naturall seede. This saith Master *Marshall* Pag. 116. of his Defence was never asserted by him. For my part, though I conceived still that Master *Marshall* would never stand to this assertion, and I acknowledged in expresse termes, that sometimes Master *Marshall* spake more warily, yet I gave many reasons why in his second conclusion his words were to be so taken, as if he had asserted that, which Master *Marshall* neither hath, nor I thinke can clearly take off, nor did I herein fasten any thing upon him against my own light, as he seemed to suspect, Pag. 116. of his Defence, and Master *Geree* Pag. 13. of his *Vindicia* padobaptismi. For the passage he brings out of my Book is not contradictory, sith I might suppose he held not all the Infants of Beleevers to be actually regenerate, and yet might suppose he held that the Covenant of saving Grace was made to them all, sith all the Elect persons have the Covenant made to them as the Apostle suppoeth, Rom. 9. 8. and yet are not actually regenerate.



regenerate. Besides Master *Marshall* in his answer to the fourth and fifth objection, speakes as if he held the Covenant of Grace conditionall, and so might hold that all the children of Beleevers have the Covenant of saving Grace made to them conditionally, though not absolutely. I will adde what Doctor *Homes* Pag. 13. of his *Animadversions* tels me. Master T. knew learned Master P. (I thinke he meanes Master *William Pemble* of *Magdalen Hall* in *Oxford*, a famous worthy writer, whose memory is very pretious to me, in whole time Doctor *Homes*, Master *Geree* and my selfe, lived together in that house to the benefit of us all) who would say, can any meere man write much, and not in any thing contradict himselfe? Why then should it be thought strange that I should conceive Master *Marshall* would contradict that in one place, which he had avouched elsewhere, especially sith I find it frequent for Protestant Divines in this very thing, to unsay in dispute against *Arminians* about perseverance, what they avow in dispute against *Anabaptists*: sure I am Master *Cottons* words which I examine in a digression, meane plainly the Covenant of saving Grace, and therefore he interprets *Gen. 17. 7.* of the Covenant of saving Grace, and Master *Philips*, that the Covenant is made to them because offered, and Master *Thomas Goodwin* in his Lectures about Infant-baptisme, meant it of the Covenant of saving Grace and therefore limited it so, as that for the most part Election did run through the loynes of Beleevers, and Master *Herle* at *Bow-Church* for Master *Goodwin* on *Heb. 8. 10.* tooke upon him to refute *Anabaptists* from thence, because the Covenant there was made with the house of *Judah*, and *Gal. 3. 14.* the blessing of *Abraham* was to come upon the *Gentiles*, and that was the Covenant of saving Grace. And for my part, I know not how to construe those words of the Directory, That the promise is made to Beleevers and their seed, any otherwise then of the promise of saving Grace, which I conceived plaine by the expression following, make this baptisme to the Infant a seale of adoption, remission of sins, regeneration and eternall life, and of all other promises of the Covenant of Grace. The Directory doth in my apprehension plainly appoint the begging for the child the accomplishment of the promise before asserted to Beleevers and their seed, and therefore as in the petition it is meant of saving Graces, so in the assertion, or else the words are so ambiguous,

biguous, as they may be a *Cathurnu*, which were more fit for a Canon of the *Council of Trent*, then for the *Directory* of a *Protestant Church*. Besides the same promise is said to be made to Beleevers seed, which is made to Beleevers, but that they will not deny to to be meant of the promise of saving Grace, therefore neither the other. To this Master Marshall Pag. 116, 117. of his Defence answers thus: 1. He leaves out the words which were for my purpose [*and of all other promises of the Covenant of Grace*] which is not right dealing: 2. He makes me to conclude from that I cite out of the *Directory*, that if there be not a promise of these saving graces to Infants, in vaine are they baptized, and the seal is put to a blanke. And this consequence he denies, but saith nothing to that which was indeed my reason, which was this, Master Marshall's second conclusion is to be understood as the words in the *Directory*, this Master Marshall grants. but the words of the *Directory* speake of a promise of saving Grace. This I prove, 1. Because the same promise is said to be made to the Beleevers seed, which is made to Beleevers, for it were a strange equivocation to understand the same terme in the same proposition in two different senses, but the promise made to Beleevers there meant, is the promise of saving Grace, ergo so is the promise to their seed. 2. Because the words speake of the same promise before, in the direction concerning Doctrine, which they meane after in the direction for petition, else there would be a *Cathurnu*, which were absurd, but in the petition they mean the promises of saving Grace, therefore also in the Doctrine. As for that which Master Marshall makes my conclusion from the words of the *Directory*, that in vaine are they baptized, the Seale is put to a blanke: It is no inference from the words of the *Directory*, but comes in in another period, at least fourteene lines after, and among other reasons it is a *medium* to prove that the second conclusion must be so understood, because that is the plea they make for Infant-baptisme, and therefore unless it be so understood, they must revoke that plea. M. Gere Pag. 13. (if I understand him aright) makes this the sense of the *Directory*, the promise is made to Beleevers and their seed, that is, it is to be presumed in charity of all the Infants of Beleevers, that they enjoy the inward graces of the promise till they discover the contrary. Wherein, though he grant that which I contend for, that



that in the *Directory* the promise is meant of saving Grace, yet he hath invented another shift to save the credit of the assertion of Master *Marshall* and the *Directory*, which he confesseth, if it be taken as I conceive it is, is so manifestly against Protestant principles and experience that none can hold it. But who would ever construe those words, *The promise is made to Beleevers and their seed*; that is, it is to be presumed in charity of all the Infants of Beleevers, that they enjoy the inward graces of the promise, till they discover the contrary, but he that would make mens words like a nose of waxe, to turne them which way he is willing they should be taken? would any man construe the words [*the promise is made to Beleevers*] any otherwise then thus, the promise of saving Grace is made by God to Beleevers? and must the same phrased in the same proposition in the other part be construed thus [*the promise is made to the seed of Beleevers*] that is, it is to be presumed by men in charity till they discover the contrary, that all the Infants of Beleevers have the inward graces of the Covenant. As if the making of a Covenant were all one with a charitable presumption, or the seed of Beleevers were all one with Infants, or when they are adulti they are not their seed. The Apostle *Rom. 9. 6, 7, 8.* when he expounded the promise, *Gen. 17. 7.* of the spirituall, not the naturall seed, did not imagine, that the making the promise was mans act of presumption, but Gods act, and *Acts 2. 39.* (to which and *Gen. 17. 7.* it's likely the *Directory* alludes) the promise, as Master *Marshall* expounds it, is of Christ and his saving benefits, and the making of it is meant of Gods act, not mans presumption. Adde hereunto that the whole series of the direction in the *Directory* carries the meaning thus. For having said, that *Baptisme is a Seale of the Covenant of Grace, of our ingrafting into Christ, and of our union with him, of remission of sins, regeneration, adoption, and life eternall,* it followes after, *that the seed and posterity of the faithfull borne within the Church, have by their birth interest in the Covenant, and right to the Seale of it, and to the outward priviledges of the Church, &c.* where the *Directory* makes a threefold interest: First, interest in the Covenant. Secondly, right to the Seale of it. Thirdly, right to the outward priviledges of the Church, the Covenant, Seale, and outward Priviledges of the Church are put as distinct things, and the Covenant they have interest in, is the same Cove-

nant of which Baptisme is a Seale, as is plaine by the Pronounne [it] which imports the same thing: Now Baptisme is before said to be the Seale of the Covenant of saving Graces, therefore the Covenant that the seed of Beleevers have interest in by their birth according to the Directory, is the Covenant of saving Graces. Which sith Master Marshall dares not assert, and Mr Gerec saith is manifestly against Protestant principles, I wish it were as it ought to be laid to heart, and that the Assembly would remember that which they say Pag 30. of the answer to the Remonstrance of the seven dissenting Brethren. And it was further declared, that even in those things which the Assembly had voted, and transmitted to both Houses of Parliament; yet we did not so leane to our own understandings, nor so prize our votes; but that if these Brethren should hold forth such light unto us as might convince us of an error: we should not only desire the Parliament to give us leave to revise our votes, but to revoke them, if there should be cause. Which would indeed bring much honour to the Assembly, and knit the hearts of the godly to them: whereas through their silence at this time, this and some other things in the Directory about baptism passing uncorrected, & standing confirmed by Law, great disquiet to the Church of God, and the undoing or molesting of many godly persons, may follow when they cannot yeeld without hurt to the Doctrine and practise of Baptisme as it is there set downe. This by the way.

## S. 10.

Of the distinction of inward and outward Covenant, and that it can stand Master Marshall in no stead, but to shew his trifling, and equivocating in his first argument, and two first conclusions, and of M. Marshall's mistake of my opinion.

But Mr. Marshall tells me pag. 110. of his Defence, you cannot be ignorant how our Divines owne the outward administration of the Covenant under the notion of *Fœdus externum* and the spirituall grace of it under the notion of *Fœdus internum*: and that still I restraine the Covenant to the spirituall part onely; and would persuade my reader, that they who speake of the Covenant of Grace, must meane it thus strictly; and yet I bring not arguments to disprove a true visible membership upon a visible profession, whether the inward saving grace be known or not. To this I answer. I confesse I have met with that distinction of *fœdus externum* & *internum*, in some Protestant writers, but not meeting with it in Mr Marshall's Sermon, I had no occasion in my Examen to meddle with it but now I will declare my thoughts of it. I confesse that Circumcision is called the Covenant, Gen. 17. 13. by a metonymy of the thing signified for the signe, as the text it selfe expounds it; and



and I confesse that the Apostle *Rom. 2. 28.* distinguisheth of *Circumcision outward in the flesh, and circumcision of the heart*: but no where in Scripture doe I meet with the distinction of the outward and inward Covenant, nor doe I conceive the expression right. For if the distinction be only *distinctio nominis*, it should be thus, Covenant is taken either properly or improperly by a trope, and not Covenant is either outward or inward, if the distinction be *distinctio rei*: then there is some common notion of a Covenant thus distributed, and so the sense must be; some Covenants, that is, promises (for the nature of a Covenant is a mutual or single promise) are either externall or internall, and this may be understood either in respect of the making of the promise, and so it is not right for all promises in that sense are externall, none internall. for afore it be declared by some transeunt act it is not a promise, but an intention. or else it may be understood in respect of the thing promised, and it is confessed that God promiseteth inward, and outward good things, and if this were the meaning I should not much except against it, though I should like it better to expresse it thus. The things covenanted are outward or inward, which is plain and easie to be understood, then to say, the Covenant is outward, or inward. But Mr Marshall by the *outward Covenant means the outward administration of it, and by the inward Covenant the spirituall grace of it.* According to which explication the distinction is not agreeable to Logick rules, nor can stand Mr Marshall in any stead, but to convince him of trifling and equivocating in his first argument, and two first conclusions. *Trifling* I say in his first argument. For the first argument was this. *The infants of beleeving parents are fœderati, therefore they must be signati.* Now Mr Marshall will not have the antecedent understood of the inward Covenant, that is the spirituall grace; he blames me for that, and he himselfe rejects it in that sense; then the sense must be, the infants of beleeving parents are *fœderati*, that is in the outward Covenant of Grace, that is according to Mr Marshall in the outward administration of the Covenant. Now what is the outward administration he expresseth pag. 48. of his Sermon, calling *Baptisme the new administration, and Circumcision the old.* This then is Mr Marshalls argument. The infants of beleevers are in the outward Covenant, that is, in the

outward administration, meaning Baptisme or Circumcision; this is the antecedent, the consequent or conclusion is, therefore they must be *signati*; that is, baptized or circumcised. But is not this a meer inept tautology; all one as to prove they must be baptized, because they must be baptized; all one as to argue, he must have *ensem*, because he must have *gladium*; this is *Pauls* Epistle, because this is *Pauls* letter. *I* said equivocating. For by the Covenant *Mr Marshall* makes shew of one thing in the first conclusion, but meanes another in the second. For he had said conclusion the first, *The Covenant of Grace for substance hath been alwayes the same*, and pag. 10. he shewes wherein lies the substance of it; to wit, the spirituall part; now who would not have expected that the second conclusion should be meant of the same Covenant to wit the inward; sith he sayes, pag. 26. *The proving the two first conclusions gains the whole cause, if the Covenant be the same, and children belong to it, then they are to be owned as Covenanters?* yea, and his first text to prove the second conclusion, *Acts 2. 39.* he himselve expounds it of *Christ and saving benefits by him*. But it seems *Mr Marshall's* heart failes him, he found that assertion too hot for him, though that be the ordinary assertion, in the Directory, in books and Sermons, insomuch that it is an usuall expression to say *infants are confederates with their beleieving parents in the Covenant of Grace*; and therefore now, the second conclusion, *that the children of beleivers belong to the Covenant of Grace*, must be understood in another sence then as the Covenant of Grace is taken in the first conclusion, which is to equivocate. Yea further by reading *Mr Marshalls* defence, pag. 92. and elsewhere *I* suspect there is a farther equivocation in *Mr Marshalls* argument, which *Mr Marshall* it seems doth not perceive, divers expressions being by him taken as the same, which are not the same; nor to be confounded. For, pag. 92. *Mr Marshall* speaks thus; *I concluded therefore that by Gads own will, such as enter into Covenant ought to receive the seale*, which seems to be the Proposition by which the sequele of *Mr Marshalls* first argument is to be proved, so that he seems to frame the Syllogisme entirely thus. They that enter into Covenant ought to receive the seale, but the children of beleivers enter into Covenant, therefore they ought to receive the seale; so that the minor seems to him to be all



all one with this Proposition: *the children are foederati*, which is  
 elsewhere expounded of the outward Covenant, or the right to  
 be baptized, but to have right to be baptized, is not all one with  
 entring into Covenant. Enttring into Covenant is some act far-  
 ther then having of right; for a person may have right to Baptism  
 before he enters into Covenant. *Mr Marshall* should have heed-  
 fully distinguished the Covenant of Grace, which is Gods act in  
 his promise of grace; and belongs to none but those he hath made  
 that promise to, and the outward administration, which is the  
 administratours act; and not have called it the Covenant, and the  
 enttring into Covenant with God, which is the act of the baptiz-  
 ed, and cannot be done ordinarily by an infant, who is onely  
 passive, and makes no promise at Baptisme; and therefore can-  
 not be rightly said to enter into Covenant with God. The want  
 of such distinctnesse in expression serves for no other purpose but  
 to puzzle a reader, and the very truth is, the argument which *Mr*  
*Marshall*, *Mr Geree*, *Doctor Homes*, &c. bring from the Cove-  
 nant to the Seale for the baptizing Infants, if it be well sifted, is  
 either a Tautology, or an equivocation; as I may more abundant-  
 ly shew, if ever I have liberty to examine their intangled discour-  
 ses. Now from hence he may know the reason why *I still restraints*  
*the Covenant to the spirituall part only*, which is, because I love to  
 speake plainly without equivocation, and as the Scripture doth,  
 and why *I would perswade the Reader*, that they who speake of the Co-  
 venant of Grace must meane it thus strictly, because I would have it  
 thought they do not equivocate, but speake plainly. And for bring-  
 ing arguments to disprove a true visible membership upon a visible pro-  
 fession, whether the inward grace be known or not, I marvel *Master*  
*Marshall* should expect this of me, who never denied a true vi-  
 sible membership upon a visible profession, whether the inward  
 Grace be known or not, but in expresse termes granted it; and  
 therefore *Master Marshall* doth untruely charge me, when he saies  
 Pag. 112. *This mistake runs through your whole booke, that none are*  
*to be reputed to have a visible right to the Covenant of Grace, but on-*  
*ly such as partake of the saving Graces of it.* And yet *Mr Marshall*  
 acknowledgeth Pag. 223. of his Defence the contrary, when he  
 saith, *to all this you assent, and consequently that there is nothing need-*  
*full according to the Word, but a visible right.* But *Master Marshall*  
 addes;

addes ; and then what will become of all your pleading, That because we cannot know that all Infants of Beleevers have the inward Grace, we may not therefore baptize them. This Master Marshall makes all my pleading, but Master Marshall neither doth nor can shew that this is all or any part of my pleading. Master Marshall Pag. 222. hath these words : And as for that you adde, That Baptisme is to be administred, not to them who may have Grace, but to them who have it. Then it seemes they are all wrongly baptized who have not inward grace. But how doth this follow from my words, with any shew of right deduction ? That because I say, it is not enough that Baptism be administred to persons, in that they may have Grace, but it is to be administred to them that have it, that therefore it seemes they are all wrongly baptized who have not inward Grace, unlesse my speech had been, that it is to be administred to none but them that have it, which cannot be drawne from my words, till it be proved that every affirmative proposition is exclusive, which true Logick will disclaime. He that saith, A Coate is not a mans because he may buy it, but because he hath bought it, doth not affirme that he only hath a Coate by right that hath bought it, for he may have right to it another way, viz. by legacy. My pleading is, because we have no command, we cannot baptize Infants without will-worship according to ordinary rule, sith the command is only to baptize Disciples, or such as professe faith. I grant that if any be a reall actuall Beleever that cannot speake, yet if he professe the Faith by other signes, or God do reveale it for him he may be baptized by the force of Philips rule, Acts 8 38. and Peters speech, Acts 10 47. But he that saith, reall actuall Beleevers may be baptized, doth not thereby affirme that they only are to bee baptized. *A proprio primo modo ad proprium secundo modo non valet argumentum.* All Crowes are black, therefore only Crowes are black, is no good argument. Master Marshall tels me Pag 95. that he is confident, that I who durst baptize an Infant known to be regenerate, durst not give the other Sacrament to it ; because more is required to make them capable of that Sacrament, then is required to make them capable of Baptisme: a regenerate Infant I think is capable of this: but besides regeneration, he is sure I will grant, that an examination of a mans selfe, and an ability to discern the Lords Body, is required to make one capable of that. To put him out of doubt, I say ; upon the same



same supposition that God should regenerate, and make an infant an actual believer I should as soone give the Lords supper as baptisme to it, as conceiving that the same actual faith that makes capable of the one makes capable of the other, and the same supernaturall extraordinary power that begets actual faith can beget selfe examination and discerning the Lords body. And thus I have answered that accusation of spending a whole sheet of paper together in confuting what was never intended by my adversary, and have retorted this point of sophistry as more justly chargeable on himselfe.

But Mr Marshall hath yet more of sophistry to charge me with, and thus he speakes pag. 3. of his defence. *But first give me leave to observe your destructive artifice. It is the Socinians way to elude all texts of Scripture, which are urged against them, if they have been differently expounded by learned and godly men, ancient or moderne: to question all conclusions infer'd by consequence from Scripture: to deride the testimonies of any of the Ancients by discovering the nakednesse, error, and oversight of those reverend men: and by making themselves merry by turning the Oration, Epistles, or allusions of the Fathers into syllogismes, and by inserting of ergo now and then, to make all their rhetorical passages seeme ridiculous. I appeal to the judicious reader, whether this plot be not carried through your Examen and exercitation.*

11. Of Master Marshall's false and most unjust charge that I carry the Socinian plot through my examen and exercitation.

It is a very sad thing that brethren should thus yeeld either to their passion; or zeale of God but not according to knowledge, so as to paint out their opponents in as ougly a forme as they can without cause. Mr Marshall appeales to the judicious reader, and I am very willing to accept of the appeale, provided that under the terme, Judicious reader, he do not meane one that is resolved to gainsay whatsoever is contrary to the streame of other reformed Churches, or the present Synod, or that may endanger his present station, or carried away with prejudice, and passion. He desires *to observe my destructive artifice*. If he meane my skill to overthrow his arguments I confesse it, it was my businesse, if he meanes something else when he names it he may have an answer. He tels me *what the Socinians way is, and would have it thought that is my way*. For the Socinians way, I have read Mr Cheynels discourse, but remember not that their way is de-

scribed as Mr *Marshall* sets it downe. I have read very little either in *Socinus*, or any *Socinian*. In that which I have read I confesse I finde much shifting and impudence in eluding the scriptures urged against them, *Christmanns Exercit. Theolog.* 20. hath collected 38 examples hereof. I finde that they make little account of the testimonies of the Ancients, since the first *Nicene Council* in the point of Christs Deity, yet they alleage thole afore the *Nicene Council* in that point, and sometimes others of the Ancients. But it is more easy for Mr *Marshall* to affirme then to prove any such *Socinian* plot in my *Examen* or *exercitation*, though Mr *Marshall* could not but know, that an advertary could hardly shew more malice, and do more mischief to a man then by bringing him into suspicion as if he were of a *Socinian* spirit. He saies, *it is the Socinian way to elude all Texts of scripture which are urged against them if they have been differently expounded by learned and godly men, ancient or modern.* The truth is, though *Socinians* do use this art, yet their proper device is, so farre as I have observed, to elude by new interpretations of their owne. But what one Text have I eluded in an, such manner? If there be any, it is either *1 Cor. 7. 14.* or *Coloss. 2. 11, 12.* For the first, though it is true I alleage eleven Authors expounding as I do, and might make a further addition. and there was great reason I should do it, because of the prejudice that was against my interpretation, yet that was not it which I rested upon, but the Analysis of the words, which being rightly stated, I found upon reason, to which neither Mr *Marshall* nor Mr *Geree* have yet answered, that the sense I gave must needs be right. And it was confessed to me by a learned man of the Assembly, that he thought *matrimonial Holines* was not all that was meant there, yet that I had sufficiently overthrowing that of *federal Holines*. Mr *Marshall* though he have altered my method and for me in clearing that text, and so obscured my elucidations of it, yet could finde eight arguments there against his opinion. And for the other text it hath been shewed before that Mr *Marshall* confesseth my sense to be his sense. The truth is, my expositions of texts are in most of them so clear that Mr *Marshall* himselfe doth grant them, though he differ from me in the inferences from them. He saies further, *it is the Socinians way to question all conclusions inferred by consequence.*



consequence from Scripture. This is the first time that ever I heard them to be charged with this. but rather finde them by Mr Cheynel and others charged with assenting to nothing but what they could conceive rationall. I remember Docter Chaloner in his *Credo Ecclesiam Catholicam* mentions this as the artifice of the Jesuites in France to stop the mouthes of Protestants by rejecting consequences, and requiring expresse texts, which being invented by Veron, was called *methodus Veroniana*, the vanity of which is refuted by Vedelius in a treatise of his. I remember I saw a printed paper taken as it is sayd from the mouth of Captaine Paul Hobson against Infant baptisme, wherein was somewhat spoken against consequences, which I disclaime. Yea, I expressly say pag. 110. of my *Examen*, But I grant, that if you make it good, by good consequence, you may recover all. I confesse I do reject the consequence drawne from the command of Circumcision to baptisme by reason of analogy, and all such analogies as being vaine yet too much pestering later, and former writings and Sermons. It is the speech of Mr Rutherford, due right of Presbyteries, Ch. 2. sect. 2. pag. 37. proportions are weake probations. But it is an overlashing to purpose in Mr Marshall to say, that I carry this Socinian plot through my examen and exercitation to question all conclusions infer'd by consequence from Scripture. Though Mr Marshall in this matter appears not to be the man I tooke him to be, yet I hope he is not come to Calumniate undaunted. I presume the Ju licious reader will judge, that Mr Marshall is bound to give me satisfaction for wronging my credit, of which he should be more tender, by so deep, & yet so palpable a false accusation. Mr Marshall makes this the Socinian way to deride the testimonies of the Ancients. Of what they do I can say little. But I challenge Mr Marshall to give one instance wherein I make my selfe meerly by turning the orations, epistles, or allusions of the Fathers into syllogismes, and by inserting of ergo now and then to make all their rhetoricall passages seem ridiculous. As for deriding the testimonies of any of the Ancients by discovering the nakednesse, &c. I do it no otherwise then the most approved Protestant writers Rivet, Perkins, Cooke, Jannes, Century-writers, Chamire, Jewel, Reynolds, &c. yea and many of the Papists themselves, Sixtus Senensis, Bellarmine, &c. who usually disclaime some writings

tings of the Ancients as spurious, and many speeches of the most approved as absurd and erroneous: yea, Mr *Marshall* himselfe in the points of infant Communion, rebaptization, necessity of Baptisme and Communion in his *Defence*, derides *Cyprian* and *Augustine* as much as *I* doe in my *Examen* in the point of Infant-Baptisme. Mr *Marshall* sayes, *my maine faculty lies in the anascenastical part, but that I bring not satisfying arguments to settle men in that I would have*. But Mr *Marshall* might remember my businesse in my *exercitation*, and *Examen* is to discover the nullity of the pleas that are made for Infant-Baptisme, in which if *I* had done no more but overthrowne the proofes that are brought out of Scripture, it had been enough. Whereas *I* have further shewed upon erroneous grounds it was taught of old, and what abuses have followed it: which surely *Smectymnus*, and *Dawolphintramis* in their pleading against *Episcopacy* and *Liturgy*, thought sufficient; however in this point Mr *Marshall* censures my *exercitation* and *examen* as insufficient. When *Smectymnus* had disputed down *Episcopacy* and *Liturgy*, they conceived they had done their part, though they referred it to the Synod to consult how to settle Church Government and worship. And why should not my disputing be thought edifying to the Church of God by overthrowing an error and abuse, which will in time be found worse then *Episcopacy* and *Liturgy*, though *I* take not upon me to direct how Baptisme is to be reduced to the right way, nevertheless when *I* am duly required to declare my opinion either about the nullity of Pædobaptisme as it is used, or the way of reducing Baptisme to its right use, whether according to conscience or prudence which *I* doubt not but may be done in time without necessity of separation, turning seekers, or popular tumult, though for the present generation by reason of preinagements, mens spirits are very averse from it,) *I* shall be willing to doe it, as being resolved; notwithstanding the unkind usage *I* have found, yet to remember my Covenant and account to God. And as *I* have not hitherto, so neither *I* hope in God ever shall foster any *Crypticall Divinity*, of which *I* need be ashamed to bring it into light, or which should justly cause men to be jealous of me as a dangerous person likely to trouble the Church, though unbrother-like Mr *Marshall* pag. 76. endeavours to represent me as if *I* were one that had need to be watched.



watched. He talkes not in a letter to me in private, but in print, of my high and scornfull spirit, but how justly may appeare by this Apology. He tells me, *I magisterially tread down under foot the arguments and reasons which others conceive strong.* But it will be hard for Mr Marshall to shew where I tread down any thing magisterially, that is without cogent reasons; and such, as were it not for his mistakes of my reasons, he himselfe would be forced to subscribe to them.

As for questioning so boldly some Doctrines which have never been questioned before, I suppose he meanes it of that which I said Pag. 23. of my Examen about rebaptization, which Master Marshall saies doth clearly discover my itch after new opinions, Pag. 67. of his Defence, and that which I say Pag 85. of my Examen, concerning the question, whether an unbaptized person may in no case eate the Lords Supper, this Master Marshall Pag. 167. of his Defence, numbers amongst my freakes and out-leapes, and saies is a spice of my itch after singular opinions. But Master Marshall might have observed, that in the former, I gave the reason of what I said, because it goes so curr:n, that rebaptization is not only an error, but also an Heresie; plainly shewing there was a necessity that cryed out against the Anabaptists as Heretikes, to bring a demonstrative reason to prove it unlawfull to baptize againe him that had been rightly baptized. For I presume, hat as King James censured Cardinall Peron for making a kind of problematicall Martyrs, calling them Martyres that dyed in maintenance of a point not certain whether it were *de fide*, so it is as absurd for our Preachers to make problematicall Hereticks, by declaiming and exciting the Magistrate against thole as Hereticks, of whom it is uncertaine whether they hold an error or no. As for Master Marshalls reasons, they are not convincing to me, nor is the holding rebaptization such a new opinion as he would make it. And for the other it is no out-leape, but a question that lay in my way by reason of Master Marshalls words, and exceeding necessary to be resolved, considering that otherwise thole Ministers and people that cannot agree about the validity of Infant-baptisme, or adult-baptisme, supposed not to be rightly done, for want of a right Ministry, or power to give the Spirit, or the manner of it's administration, must of necessity separate from Communion in the Lords Supper for this reason, be-

§. 12.

Of M. Marshalls unjust charge of me as itching after new opinions, and particularly about rebaptization and receiving the Lords Supper afore Baptism.

*An Apologie for the two Treatises*

cause none is to be admitted to the Lords Supper till he be rightly baptized: which I professe is to be stood upon in point of prudence for right order; yet if it be stood upon in point of conscience, so as in no case the contrary is to be permitted, it will of necessity make many superstitious perplexities in Ministers, and inferre many an unnecessary Schisme, this being not a sufficient reason for a refusall of Communion, because a Godly person takes his baptisme to be right, though I know the contrary. Nor do I thinke the thing either such a new opinion or practise. For besides, that it may be doubted whether all the Apostles were baptized, as suppose *Matthew* (which is as probable for the negative as the affirmative) yet were admitted to the Lords Supper by Christ himselfe: when *Constantine* the Great and others did differre their baptisme so long, it is not likely they never received the Lords Supper afore their baptisme. Nor is it inconsistent with my grants: For what though I grant *that Baptisme is the way and manner of solemn admission into the Church*, meaning the regular way, yet it followes not that none may receive in any case afore baptized. Mr *Marshall* holds Ordination by a Presbytery is the regular way of solemn admission into the office of publike Preaching, and it may be fit by an Ecclesiasticall Canon to order it so; yet I thinke it will not be denied, but that there may be cases, wherein a person may lawfully be a publike Preacher without such ordination. The other grant which Master *Marshall* saies is mine, was never expressed by me so rawly as he laies it downe. It is not as he puts it downe, *that nothing is to be done about the Sacraments, whereof we have not either institution or example*: but as Master *Marshall* might have perceived if he had heeded my words, *Examen, Pag. 28. Pag. 110. Pag. 152. That no positive worship, or essentiall, or substantiall part of it, is to be done without institution by precept, or Apostolicall example*, I never denied, that many things pertaining to circumstance and order may be done about the Sacraments without either, and of this kind I conceive Baptizing afore eating the Lords Supper to be. As for such other new opinions, why are not Doctor *Twisse*, and Master *Gataker*, and indeed all that cleere truth more fully then others, censured in the like manner? I wish if my words would take any impression on him, that Master *Marshall* would forbear thus judging least he be judged. I thinke I know my selfe better then

Master



Master Marshall, and I told him, my reall intention was to discover truth, yea all my wayes shew me free from this itch after new opinions, though I professe my selfe an impartiall searcher of truth, *nullius addictus jurare in verba magistri*, no not to the determinations of the Assembly. May it not with better reason be said, they have an itch after new opinions, who hold that without power to suspend all scandalous persons from the Lords Supper, a man cannot with a good conscience be a Pastour, that without this power the Church of Christ is to be suspended from the Lords Supper many yeares, &c. And for sleighting of authors, I have answered it already.

There is yet another Charge, as if I should alleadge Authors against their mind. As first Master Daniel Rogers. I said Master Daniel Rogers in his Treatise of the Sacrament of Baptisme, Part. I. Pag. 79. confessed himselfe unconvinced by demonstration of Scripture for it. Master Marshall writes to Master Daniel Rogers, he answers in these words: *If I were to answer that Anabaptist, I should answer him silencio, & contemptu: for why should I not? since in that very place of my Sacraments, Part. I. Pag. 78, 79. where I confute those Schismaticks, he snatches my words from their own Defence: My words are, I confesse my self unconvinced by any demonstration of Scripture for Pedabaptisme, meaning by any positive Text; what is that to helpe him? except I thought there were no other arguments to evince it: now what I thinke of that, my next words shew, Pag. 77. line 4, 5, 6, 7. I need not transcribe them. In a word, this I say, though I know none, yet that is no argument for the non-baptizing of Infants, since so many Scriptures are sufficiently convincing for it. Therefore this want of a positive Text must no more exclude Infants, &c. then the like reason should disannull a Christian Sabbath, or womenkind not to be partakers of the Supper: The quoting of mine owne text were enough. I will set down his words as I find them, that the Reader may judge whether there be truth in it, that I have snatched his words from their own Defence, and whether he did not oppose demonstration of Scripture to unwritten tradition. The words are thus: I say this for the setting of such as are not wilfull, that take the baptism of Infants to be one of the most reverend, generall, and uncontroverted traditions which the Church hath, and which I would no lesse doubt of then the Creed to be Apostolicall. And although I confesse my selfe*

S. 13.  
Of alleadging  
Authors against  
their mind, particu-  
lar Mr Daniel  
Rogers, M. Ball,  
Chamier, Ar-  
etius, and Beza.

An Apologie for the two Treatises

1 Cor. 7. 14.

yet unconvinced by demonstration of Scripture for it, yet first silence Circumcision was applied to the Infants the eighth day in the Old Testament: Secondly there is no words in the New Testament to infringe the liberty of the Church in it, nor speciall reason why we should bereave her of it. Thirdly, sundry Scriptures affoord some friendly proofes by consequent of it. Fourthly, the holinesse of the child (externall and visible) is from their parents, who are (or ought to be) catechised confessors, penitents, and Protestants in truth (which priviledge only open revolt disables them from) therefore I say, the Seed being holy, and belonging to the Covenant, the Lord graciously admits them also to the Seale of it in Baptisme. If Master Marshall please he may write backe to his reverend and learned friend, that the suppoed Anabaptist thinks his plaister too narrow for the sore, that he seems to eat his own words, that his words help me to shew that he once thought it indeed one of the most reverend, generall, and uncontroled traditions which the Church hath, and which he would no lesse doubt of, then the Creed to be Apostolicall, which if he meane it of the Creed called the Apostles as it is now, Parker in his booke *de descensu ad inferos*, and others have shewed to have been made long after the Apostles dayes, and the tale of their meeting to compose it, in the exposition on the Creed, attributed to *Ruffinus*, or some other to be of no credit. And for Scripture, Master Rogers findes but friendly proofes, somewhat like *Bellarmines pie & probabiliter credi potest*, and that there is no word in the New Testament to infringe the liberty of the Church in it: which if Master Rogers can satishe himself with, he may, I professe I dare not so play with my own conscience, and I thought this was fit to be told Master Marshall, to shew that I was not the only man that questioned, whether his proofes for Infant-baptisme were so undeniable as he would have them; and that's enough to shew the unreasonableness of the violence of his spirit against those that differ from him. And for his *Quære* why he should not answer me, *silencie & contemptu*: I presume Master Marshall hath long since done that office of a friend to tell him it is written *Rom. 14. 10. Why doest thou set at naught thy brother?*

I had said not as Mr Marshall repeats it, Master Ball cuts the sinewes of the argument from Circumcision, but, me thinkes Mr Balls words cut the sinewes of that argument. And so they do plainly.



ly. For if *however Circumcision and Baptisme agree or differ we must looke to the institution*, and the agreement is not enough to conclude, that Baptisme belongs onely to members in Church-Covenant, and their children, because it was so in Circumcision without an institution, as the *new England Elders* reason, by the same reason *however Baptisme and Circumcision agree or differ*: yet Baptisme will not belong to Infants, because Circumcision did so by vertue of proportion, without an institution, which if Mr Ball or Mr Marshall could shew, they needed not trouble us with the Command about Circumcision of male infants, to prove Infant-Baptisme, which is indeed to maintain that the ceremoniall law still binds, which is plain Judaisme. But what sayes Mr Marshall to this? If Mr Marshall cut the sinewes of the argument from Circumcision to Baptisme, himselfe was very much mistaken in his his own meaning and intention, because in the same place he makes them parallell in this, and I might have done well to have informed the reader so much. I was told, there was a very intelligent man that said he was sorry that I had Mr Marshall for my Antagonist, as knowing him to be apt to mistake, which he conceived would be a vexation to me, and indeed I find his words true. For whereas I said only Mr Ball's words, cut the sinewes of that argument; M. Mar. mistakes it as if I had said, Mr Ball intends to cut the sinews of that argument, and that then he was mistaken in his own meaning and intentions. I confesse it were a very strange thing to charge so understanding a man as Mr Ball with such a mistake of his owne meaning and intention: but it is no such strange thing for a learned man to speak that which may be brought to inferre the contrary to that he intended, and if this be to abuse men, then all arguments by retortion are abuses. Bellarmine l. 5 de justificatione c. 7 prop. 3. had said, *propter incertitudinem propriae justitiae & periculum inanis gloriae tutissimum est totam fiduciam in sola Dei misericordia & benignitate reponere*. This, King James in his Apologie for the oath of Allegiance brings to prove that he overthrowes thereby all his former dispute about inherent righteousness, though Bellarmine had put in a speciall caution in the next words to prevent that inference, and King James left out that caution in the recitall, yet Bishop Andrewes in his *Tortura Torti*, and many other learned men justified King James, and that rightly.

Mr Marshall, pag. 47. saith thus. And I am sure you must agree with me. Sixthly, that of all these testimonies you have cited out of Chamier, there is not one word against my interpretation, or for the justification of yours; yea and I know also that you will agree with me. Seventhly, that the learned Chamier in a large dispute doth confute your interpretation and vindicate my interpretation, as the onely true and proper meaning of this text even in that very place, where you quote him. And therefore I know the reader will agree with mee (whether you doe or no) that you doe but abuse your Author and Reader both, in making a flourish with Chamiers name no hing to the purpose, and thereby would make the Reader to conceive Chamier to be of your side, when he is point-blanke against you. And in the same page. First you severall times cite the learned Beza as if he were of your mind in the interpretation of this text, to construe it of matrimoniall holinesse. I confesse the cause depends not upon Beza's judgement, but your reputation depends much upon making this good, that you should dare to cite an Author as interpreting it for you, who interprets it expressely against you. p. 159. I perswade my self you are by this time ashamed of your impertinent quotation, I assure my selfe if you be not, your friends are p. 157. But Sir why do you thus frequently abuse your Readers with the names of learned men, inserting some one sentence of theirs into your booke, and thereby insinuating to your Reader, that they are of your opinion in the point wherein you cite them? I assure you, it concernes your conscience as well as your cause, to be thus often taken caddy. Mr Gerec vindic. Pædobaptism. pag. 22. which you expresse in Beza's words, but against Beza's mind. pag. 28. And therefore I wonder you should so of an allege an Author impertinently, especially such an one as is pointually and rationally against you. To all this I answer. If Mr Marshall could have shewed that I had either falsified the words or wrested their meaning, he had said something: but to tell me, because I allege the words of authors according to their meaning, to prove the contrary to that they hold, therefore I abuse them; and insinuate to the Reader that they are of my mind, or side, when they are point-blanke against me, or that my allegation is impertinent, is nothing more than to charge me with a charge, that it deserves no other answer, than Mr Marshall's own words out of Horace, pag. 154. *risum tenetis amici?* If my friends be ashamed of



of my impertinent quotations, it is because Mr Marshall and Mr Gere have misrepresented them, otherwise those my quotations are every one of them pertinent to the particular point I allege them for, and not yet answered by Mr Gere or Mr Marshall. And I confesse I cannot but smile at Mr Marshall's conceit of me, when he sayes. *And I am sure you must agree with me. Sixthly, that in all these testimonies you have cited out of Chamier, there is not one word against my interpretation or for the justification of yours; as if I were another Claudius to subscribe to my own condemnation: which if I doe in this thing, he may well beg me for a fool.* It is untruly ascribed to me that I cite Beza, as if he were of my mind in the interpretation of I Cor. 7. 14. to construe it of matrimoniall holinesse. For whereas I did distinctly explain first the term sanctified in the forepart of the verse & then the terms *unclean* & *holy* in the later (which M. Marshall confounding in his defence; & to putting all my arguments together to the number of eight, as he multiplies them, & not sorting them as I did, hath made his answers colourable, but indeed misleads the unwary Reader) and though I knew Beza to disagree from me in expounding the term [*holy*] which I had expressly set down, pag. 16. of my *exercitation*; and therefore never intended to abuse the Reader, or to intinate that he was of my side, in the expounding the latter part of the verse, yet he expounds the first part with me of *matrimoniall sanctification*, and so I said, pag. 73 57, of my *Examen*, not that Beza did construe it of *matrimoniall holines*, but *matrimoniall sanctification*; which I should wonder Mr Marshall did not consider being so plainly and necessarily distinguished by me, but that distemper of body or mind, or hat to prevent the studying of my book by crying it down (the like whereto may be said of Doctor *Homer* and Mr *Gere*) made him compose his answer afore hee had well studied my book. As for Chamier I did, pag. 76. expressly say his opinion was for *federal holinesse*. *De federali illa sanctitate quid dicam? verum in mentem Chamiero Calvinus, &c.* and yet I need not be ashamed to bring his own words against his own tenet, no more then King James to bring *Bellarmines* words against him, or Bishop *Marion* to bring the *Stapists* words against them, or Mr Marshall himselfe to bring my words against me, but rather indeed it is most commendable to bring an authors

words to refute his own opinion as being a most cogent and pertinent way of disputing. And for *Aretius* pag. 92. of my *Examen*, I used this very expression [*saves rightly in this*] intimating that though he agree with M. *Marshall* in his inference from *Col. 2. 11. 12.* yet those words which I cited, and that rightly, served to overthrow Mr *Marshall's* reason, from whence their inference is gathered. And therefore it concernes Mr *Marshall's* conscience as well as his cause to be thus often taken tardy in false accusations, & insinuations against me. As for that he tells me of *Aretius* his opinion there and elsewhere, it is indeed a meer impertinency; sith I never denied *Aretius* to be of his opinion, and therefore if I may use his own phrased, pag. 147. *he doth but bumbast his booke to no purpose.*

S. 14.  
Of Master  
*Marshall's* un-  
just charging  
Anabaptists,  
with a bloody  
sentence, con-  
demning  
all the infants  
of beleevers as  
having no-  
thing to doe  
with the Cove-  
nant of  
Grace; his im-  
puting to me as  
if I held that  
they, all belong  
actually to  
the kingdome  
of the Devill,  
no more pro-  
mise for them  
then for chil-  
dren of Turkes,  
their actuall  
standing in  
the visible  
kingdome of  
the Devill.

And here I cannot but take notice, that whereas Master *Marshall* had charged in the first use of his Sermon the Anabaptists with a rash and bloody sentence condemning all the infants of the whole Church of Christ, as having nothing to doe with the Covenant of Grace or the seale of it, and then aggravates it as like *Hazaels* act, I said, pag. 170. of my *Examen*, till you produce some testimonies of those you call Anabaptists so determining, I shall take it to be but a false accusation, and a fruit of passion, nor of holy zeale. Mr *Marshall* both pag. 5. and pag. 243. of his *Defence*, saith thus. *I compared not their intentions with his, but the fruits of their principles casting all beleevers children, as much out of the covenant of Grace as they doe the children of Turkes and Pagans; and this I am sure they doe, and your selfe joyne with them who acknowledge no more promise for the children of beleevers, then for the children of the Turkes, and leave them to have their actuall standing in the visible kingdome of the Devill.*

In this reply Mr *Marshall* brings no testimony out of the Anabaptists writings to prove them guilty of that rash, and bloody sentence he doth in expresse termes charge them with; suppose Mr *Marshall* should be able (which I am assured he cannot do) to prove by consequence that by their principles, they condemn all the infants of the whole Church of Christ, as having nothing to doe with the Covenant of Grace, or the Seale of it (which were the words of his Sermon. pag. 52. though in his defence he alter the words to mince the matter) yet *Davenant* exhorts to brotherly communion, Ch. 12. *Gataker* vindication against Walker, and many



many other cry out against it as most unreasonable to accuse men of that sentence which themselves disclaime, because it followes from their principles by remote consequence, much more in downright termes to say, *they passe a bloody sentence, and condemn all the infants of beleivers.* If it should follow from their principles, yet Mr. Marshall were not acquitted from rashnes, false accusation and passion in those his speeches. I have proved from Mr. Marshall's principle, pag. 35. of his Sermon *that all Gods commands and institutions about the Sacraments of the Jewes bind us as well as they did them in all things which belong to the substance of the Covenant, and were not accidentall to them,* that it inferres an obligation to all the *Mosaicall* ceremonies, and consequently *Judaisme*; yet Mr. Marshall would not think it equall I should charge him with *Judaisme*, and then make a declamation against him as turned Jew, and preaching *Judaisme*, and to be abandoned by Christians as going about to make them Jewes. Why then doth Mr. Marshall deale so with others? I know Mr. Marshall, pag. 198. of his defence, endeavours to justifie his principle: he tells me, *that his meaning never was to assert the practise of the rituall part in the least particle, but that there is a generall nature, end and use in which they doe agree;* which is to answer just nothing. For the question was concerning the commands of the Jewes whether they bind, and particularly whether the command of circumcising infants bind us virtually; now all the commands are about the practise of the rituals, and if they bind they are still in force: the generall nature is contained in the definition, which is *eterna veritatis*, and expressed in an enunciation, and is not commanded but declared, and so is the generall end and use to be known and beleaved, not to be practised: but commands are *orationes non enunciativae*, never of the generall nature, but of particular acts. Who did ever talke of a command that a man should be *animal rationale*, or of a Sacrament that it should be a Seale of the Covenant? 2. Mr. Marshall tells us he did not compare the Anabaptists and Hazael's intentions, but the fruit of their principles. The truth is, Mr. Marshall did not compare their intentions, nor the fruit of their principles, with Hazael's act; but their bloody sentence with his act. As for casting out of the Covenant of Grace, indeed and before God, no promise or error of ours can doe it, were our in-

tentions never so malicious, the malice of men cannot nullifie the  
 faith of God. As for casting out in their sentence, I conceive it  
 suspends any judgement of them; we can neither say they are in  
 or out: yea, I say again if all be examined, *Mr Marshall* puts  
 them as much out as we, unless *Mr Marshall* understand no more  
 by the Covenant of Grace then Baptisme, which though *Mr*  
*Marshall* may doe in a popular auditory, which cannot discern  
 between chalke and cheele, yet me thinks he should forbear to  
 doe it in print, in a treatise dedicated to the *Assembly of Divines*.  
 But I wonder the lesse at *Mr Marshall's* rashnesse in accusing the  
*Ana* a stilt, when he is not ashamed to tell me thus, pag. 238. of  
 his defence. *It is your judgement that all infants, even of beleevers*  
*as well as Pagans, though they may potentially belong to the King-*  
*dome of Christ, yet actually they belong to the Kingdome of the De-*  
*vill;* which I am sure he no where findes in my writings, but to  
 the contrary in divers passages, as *exercit* pag. 24. But saith *Mr*  
*Marshall*, you acknowledge no more promise for the children of be-  
 leovers, then for the children of Turks. This matter I had disputed  
 at large, part. 2. S. 10 of my *Examen*, and to mitigate the odium  
 which popular preachers cast on us by this Allegation I had said,  
 so doth the opinion of *Cyprian* with his 66 Bishops that would have  
 Gods grace denied to none: and therefore his opinion puts all the  
 infants of beleevers in the same condition with Turks children. To  
 this saith *Mr Marshall* pag. 85. of his defence, which I have shewed,  
 will not follow out of the words of the Epistle. Now that I conceive  
 he means he had formerly shewed is, pag. 41 in these words,  
 though he layes it downe in generall termes, that none are to be hin-  
 dred from comming to Christ: yet what he sayes ought to be under-  
 stood of the Church, because he speakes of such as God hath cleansed  
 or purified, who were common: which passage I should too-  
 ner have expected from a Jesuit then *Mr Marshall*, to say that *Cy-*  
*prian* ought to be understood of the Church, when the words *mul-*  
*ti hominum nato misericordiam Dei & gratiam denegandam, &*  
*nulla anima perdenda est:* are as expresse as may be, that he means  
 it of any that are born of mankind, that the grace of God is not to be  
 denied them. And after, *omnem omnino hominem ad gratiam Chri-*  
*sti admittendum esse,* and the reason he useth is not from a cle. n-  
 sing proper to the Church, but because all men are equal, quando a



*Deo femel facti sumus*, as he that reads the Epistle, will presently perceive. I alleaged also the words of the *Grave confirmation of the Brownists* published by Mr *Rushband*, to shew not that which Mr *Marshall* it seems intended, which was to charge all the Anabaptists of putting all the children of believers out of the Covenant of Grace as the Turks children, but to shew that the opinion of paedobaptism, as some assert it, doth put all the infants of believers into the selfe-same condition with the infants of *Turkes and Indians* (which were Mr *Marshall's* words) by putting all of them alike into the Covenant of Grace. For if they may be lawfully accounted within Gods Covenant, if any of their Ancestors in any generation were faithful, and that because of Gods promise, *Exod. 20. 5.* then the children of *Turks* are lawfully accounted within the Covenant, yea all the infants in the world, for it is not beyond the thousandth generation to *Noah*. Mr *Marshall* tells me that he supposeth I do not think those words, *Exod. 20. 5.* were intended to intimate that all the children in the world, who came from *Adam* or *Noah* were included in the Covenant of Grace, nor that I believe Mr *Rushband* thought so. What Mr *Rushband* thought I know not but his words import so much, and if that was not intended, the text was impertinently alleaged; and though it is true I do not think with them, yet I might fitly alleage their words which I approve not, to shew this is no such absurdity, which Mr *Marshall* called a great mischief, that by the *Anti-paedobaptists* opinion, all the children of believers should be put into the same condition with the children of *Turkes*; with the same followes on the *Paedobaptists* doctrine also. I had also *Examen*, part. 2. §. 10. set down my opinion freely in 4 Propositions about the parity of condition of the *Turks* and our infants, and told Mr *Marshall* thus possibly if you open your selfe plainly, there will be no difference between us. Mr *Marshall* in his *Defence* neither plainly opens himselfe, wherein he puts the difference, nor sets down my answer justly, but leaves out wholly the the fourth Proposition, or confounds it with the third; and otherwife mangles and alters my words in his abridgement, that they are much unlike what I delivered. For instance, pag. 85 he sets down this for my second proposition. *That I know no more promise for believers children, then for the children of unbelievers* whereas my words are these.

For

*An Apologie for the two Treatises*

For the Covenant or Promise of Grace, that is righteousness and life in Christ, though I acknowledge a peculiar promise to Abrahams naturall posterity mentioned, Rom. 11. 27. yet I know not that God hath made such a Covenant to any, much lesse to all the naturall beleeving seed of any beleeving Gentile; and Propol. 3. I say, they have some promises, though generall indefinite and conditionall. And I mean by generall and indefinite, such as determine not the kind of good promised, nor the particular person; and therefore are true, if performed to any persons in any sort of good: and conditionall upon condition of faith and obedience, as, when it is said *the generation of the righteous shall be blessed, by their righteousness to childrens children, to such as keep his Covenant.* Pl. 103. 17. 18. Ps. 112. 2. &c. I tell Mr Marshall if he can shew any more promises then I doe, I shall count them a treasure; if not, why doth he endeavour to make me and my opinion odious to the people, as if I put all the children of the whole Church out of the Covenant of Grace, as I doe the children of the Turkes; and acknowledge no more promise for the one, then for the other: whereas when he hath said as much as he can for them, he can bring no more promise for them then I doe, nor dares reject the limitations I restrain them by?

But sayes Mr Marshall, you leave them to have their actuall standing in the visible kingdome of the Devill. I ask whither the children have actuall standing in the visible kingdome of the Devill afore they are baptized or not? If he say they have not, then by not baptizing, I leave them not in the visible kingdome of the Devill; they are out of the visible kingdome of the Devill, though they be not baptized: if he say they have their actuall standing in the visible kingdome of the Devill afore they are baptized, then how is it true which the Protestants disputing against Bellarmine alleage against the necessity of baptizing infants to salvation, that the children of beleevers are holy afore baptism. The truth is, I neither leave infants in the Devills, nor Gods visible kingdome: for I conceive they are in neither kingdom visibly till they declare by their profession to whom they belong visibly. Mr Marshall used often this expression of *belonging to the visible kingdome of the Devill*, and I told him *Examen* pag. 41. I feared he did it *ad faciendum populum, to move the people*, by affrighting them by a bugbear



beare word, if they keep their children from baptisme, then they leave them to have an actuall standing in the visible kingdome of the Devill, or to please them by making them beleieve that by baptisme their children are put out of the visible kingdome of the Devill. This *I said not judging his heart*, but being jealous least it was so; and *I confesse I am still suspicious he doth so*, because he still useth it after he hath been told it, and it is a meer engine to stirre popular affections. For how hath the unbaptized infant an actuall standing in the visible kingdome of the Devill; unlesse it be true that all unbaptized persons have an actuall standing in the visible kingdome of the Devill, which is false in the *Catechumeni* of old, the converted theefe on the Crosse, *Constantine the Great*, and many others who were in the visible kingdom of the Christ afore they were baptized. On the other side, thousands of people in *America* baptized by the *Spaniards*, had as visible standing in the Devills kingdome as before. *I confesse* when the baptized professeth the faith of Christ, then baptisme is a note of a visible member, and a *distinguishing badge between the people of God and the Devill*, and so by baptisme a person is exhibited a member of the Church, but otherwise *I see no reason why an infant that makes no profession of Christ, should be counted after baptisme a visible member of the Church more then before*. Let a child of a Christian be baptized, and after being an infant, and taken by a Turke, be circumcised, wherein is that child more a visible member of the Church of Christ then a Turkes child, or is hee not rather a member of the Church of Mahomet, then of Christ? Are the *Janizaries* any whit the more Christians because they were baptized infants of Christian Greekes? Protestant writers are wont to define the visible Church of Christians a *number of persons that professe the faith of Christ*. So Art. 19 of the Church of England, and all sorts of Protestant writers. Now that which makes the visible Church, makes each member a visible member, and that is profession. Baptisme and the Lords Supper; and hearing, are notes as they signify profession, otherwise if a person be baptized, if he should heare or receive the Lords Supper, and did not professe the faith, he should not be a visible member for all that. *I confesse I have met with some writings which put Baptisme into the definition of the Church, as necessary to the being*

of a visible Church, and the words in the *Confession of Faith* of the  
 7 Churches of Anabaptists about London [being baptized into that  
 faith] Artic. 33. are somewhat doubtfull, though they seem ra-  
 ther to import that Baptisme is necessary to the right order of a  
 Christian Church, then to the being of a Church; and I confesse  
 they that hold that members are added to the Church by Bap-  
 tisme and not otherwise, and hold a nullity of Pædo baptisme,  
 must needs say the Churches that have no other then Infant-  
 Baptisme, are no true Churches; nor their members Church-  
 members, as Master *Ma* shall sayes pag. 84. of his *Defence*;  
 and so voluntary separation necessary. But these points of the  
 necessity of right Baptisme, not onely to the right order, but also  
 to the being of a visible Church and Church-member, and so vo-  
 luntary separation barely for the defect of it, I have ever dis-  
 claimed; as considering the many errors and ill consequences  
 that would follow thereupon, and though provocations still in-  
 crease, yet I have in my practise shunned separation from my dis-  
 senting brethren, and I presume though Mr *Marshall* count right  
 Baptisme a necessary duty, yet he will be more advised then to  
 make it essentiall, either *constitutive* or *consecrative* to the being  
 of a Church or Christian either visible or invisible, for feare of  
 giving too much advantage to Separatists, and Seekers. I suppose  
 in reference to the present point this is the truth, that however e-  
 very infant is either in the invisible kingdome of God or Satan,  
 that is, elect or reprobate; yet no child till hee make profession  
 doth visibly belong either to the one, or to the other. I acknow-  
 ledge that in the visible Church of the *Jewes*, the infants were  
 reckoned to the Church, and the reason was from the peculiar  
 Church-state of the *Jewes*. For then God took the whole  
 family of *Abraham* together in one day, and after the whole na-  
 tion of the *Jewes*, were but one Church or congregation: *Acts*  
 7. 28. and accordingly appointed one Tabernacle and Altar, and  
 one high Priest, and solemne feasts for all to meet at, and one name  
 on all badge, circumcision; and hee erected them into one policy;  
 because he would have one fixed people among, and from whom  
 the *Messiah* should come; and therefore he so provided, that their  
 tribes should be distinguished, their inheritance divided, and ma-  
 ny more such things, which he did not so at then on since, ap-  
 point



point to any other people. And this Church-state Circumcision was applyed to, so that if *Master Marshall* and *Master Geree* will conclude from *Rom. 11. 17. &c.* that we must have our children baptized, because they had theirs circumcised, we being ingrafted into their room, they must not only prove that the Gentile-beleevvers are grafted into the invisible Church in place of the *Jewes* (which is the Apostles sence there notwithstanding, that which *M. Geree*, or *Master Marshall* have said) nor that the Gentile visible Churches are grafted into the visible Church in the place of the *Jewes*: but they must also prove that the Gentiles are taken into the same outward Church state which the *Jewes* had. But that is most false. For now God gathers not a whole nation together, nor hath appointed one Temple Altar, Priest, &c. as he did to the *Jewes*: but he gathers now by preaching, some here, some there, and the visible Church hath now no such policy or outward government as the *Jewes* had then: and therefore there is not the same reason of infants belonging to the visible Church of the Gentiles as they did to the *Jewes*, except one can prove that we are to have the same outward face and constitution of the Church which they had, which Papists and others imagining have corrupted the Church, and baptizing of infants ariseth out of the same Jewish conceit.

*Master Marshall* had alleaged in his Sermon *Rom. 11. 16. &c.* to prove his second conclusion. *I* complained in my *Examen* of the obscurity of his inference, shewed him how ambiguous his words were. He takes this as if it were done in scorne, and as an artifice to darken an argument, but doth not mend the matter in his *Defence*. For 1. pag. 134. whereas *I* distinguished of grafting in, that it may be either by faith, or profession of faith; or by some outward Ordinance: *Master Marshall* in the repetition leaves out this last member, which is not right dealing. 2. Whereas *I* had said: *The thing that is to be proved is, that all the infants of every beleever are in the Covenant of free Grace in Christ, and by vertue thereof to be baptised.* *Master Marshall* pag. 135. of his *D fence* denies this, though it seemed plaine to me, that this text was brought to prove his second conclusion, which *I* took to bee the same with the antecedent of his Enthymeme, or first argument; and that *I* did conceive had this sence, that all the infants of every

A large dis-  
quisition of  
*R m. 11. 17.*  
&c. wherein is  
shewed that  
the ingrafting  
there is into  
the invisible  
Church by e-  
lection and  
giving faith,  
and that it  
proves not In-  
fant-baptisme.

beleever are in the Covenant of free Grace in Christ, otherwise his first argument is but nugatory, the antecedent and conclusion being the same; and he equivocates in his two first conclusions, understanding the first conclusion of the covenant of saving Grace in Christ, the other of the outward Covenant as hee calls it, as I shewed above: which serves for no better end then to delude a reader. But pag. 135. he saith thus; *The thing to be proved from this text is, that our infants have the same right which the infants of the Jewes had,* pag. 140. *The thing to be proved was, our infants have the same priviledge with theirs;* yet in the same page he thus formeth the conclusion, *and therefore we and they making up the same body are taken in upon the same ground, our children with us, as well as theirs with them:* which last conclusion I do not take to be the same with the former, nor any one of them the same, with the other or with the antecedent of Mr Mar. second argument, or his second conclusion, 3. It is yet uncertain to me what is the *medium* he would prove his conclusion by out of that text. In his Defence in three places he calls his confused heap of Dictates his argument, to wit, pag. 134. *The Apostles scope was to shew that we Gentiles have now the same grafting into the true olive which the Jewes formerly had; and our present grafting in is answerable to their present casting out, and their taking in at the latter end of the world, shall be the same grafting [though more gloriously] as ours is now; and it is apparent that at their first taking in, they and their children were taken in, at their casting out they and their children were broken off; and when they shall be taken in againe at the end of the world, they and their children shall be taken in together, and all by vertue of the Covenant, Ero Deus tuus, &c. which is the same to us, and to them; we and they making up the Church of God. In the same page in these words. Looke how the Jewes children were grafted in, so are our children, we are taken instead of them who were cast out, and become an v. sible Kingdom of Christ with the rest of them who kept their station,* pag. 140. *We as they, were taken in; they and their children shall be at the last taken in again, as they were at the first: and therefore we and they making up the same body, are taken in upon the same ground, our children with us, as well as theirs with them.* Which though hee calls his argument, and layes it hath a plaine sense, yet I see so many



many ambiguities still in his words, his speeches so informe or shapelesse, that I know not well whither he would make many syllogismes or one, nor which to call the major, which the minor Proposition or terme, or which the medium; and I must professe I find Mr *Marshall* still so confused a disputer, that I know not to what purpose his manner of writing in this point should tend, but to puzzle his reader, and weary his respondent. And sith he was told of this, p. 56. of my *Examen*, and desired to mend it in his next writing; yet in stead of mending it, he puts it off lightly, pag. 125. of his *Defence*, a person may suspect it is done on purpose to puzzle, rather then to satisfy. For why should a man that would clear truth in a point of dispute, though in a Sermon *ad populum*; especially when his auditory is such as it was at Westminster Abby, be unwilling to make a syllogisme in mood and figure? did not *Master Marshall* make sundry syllogismes in the same Sermon? And would not a short syllogisme after a distinct short paraphrase, have better cleared the truth then such a confused heap of words he useth in his alleaging, *Rom. 11. 16. &c.* And *Acts 2. 39.* However what reason or excuse he can pretend for not doing it in his *Defence*, I see not.

*Mr Gere* in his *vindicia Pado-baptismi*, ch. 1. sect. 3. goes somewhat more distinctly to work, yet neither doth he frame a syllogisme from *Rom. 11. 11. 12. 13. 17. 18. &c.* nor doe I know how he would have it framed. He saith, *the conclusion to be proved is, that the children of Christians have the same priviledge with children of Jewes, as they were comprehended so under the Covenant with their parents as to be reputed members of the same visible kingdome, and to be sealed with them.* This conclusion I deny if it be understood of the outward priviledge belonging to the Jewish Church in that state it was afore Christs comming. To prove it he layes down four Propositions, and deduceth four consectaries, but how he shews not. The third is ambiguous, and if he mean by [*into the place of the Jewes cut off*] the same Church-state, and by [*partaking of their priviledge*] the priviledges belonging to their Church-state as I think he doth, it is to denied, and so likewise his second and third consectary in that sense. Nor doth either *Rom. 11. 17.* prove it as shall be presently shewed, nor is a beleeving Jew a looser by the coming of Christ in regard of his

*An Apologie for the two Treatises*

seed, sith this was a peculiar priviledge in the time of that Church state, which now ceaseth to be a priviledge, Christ being come; as in like manner the Temple, High Priest, &c. doe, which I have more largely discussed *Examen*, part. 3. §. 11. And for the fourth confectary, if it be understood of pristine Church-state, I likewise deny it. I grant *the promise will bee extended to them and their seed*, but how? Not by an outward ordinance or initiall seale, as it is called, applyed to infants, but by the communicating *the spirit and word of God to them and their seed*; as the text he allegeth imports, *Isai. 59. 20*. Nor by holding that neither Jewes nor Gentiles now are to have their infants sealed wil follow, *that there will be two distinct states in the Christian Churches: one of the Jews holy Fathers and children, another of the Gentiles who have only personall priviledges, none for their seed*; for neither doth Baptisme belong to the one or the other, because they the are seed of beleivers: and for regeneration and saving benefits, the Lord bestowes to the seed of either as pleaseth him. Nor would this conceit of mine set up or keep up a partition wall still contrary to the Apostle, *Ephes. 2. 14*. For then a partition wall is kept up when the Gentiles as Gentiles are excluded from access to God, which is not done by my doctrine, they that hold that the command about Circumcision still binds virtually, come nearer to the setting up a partition wall in the Apostles sense. I return to Mr Marshall.

Mr Marshall in his Sermon as I conceived made this the thing he would prove, *that we and our children are grafted in together*; this I granted in some sense to be true, that God doth usually call and adopt the children with the Fathers, but I denied it to be so perpetually; so as that a rule for an outward ordinance may be framed thence. And so farre as I can collect the chiefe meaning Master Marshall and Master Gere take hence to prove it is, *that we Gentiles have the same ingrafting into the true olive which the Jewes formerly had*. This Master Marshall made the Apostles scope, though the truth is it is so farre from being the Apostles scope, that it agrees not with his words, who makes the ancient Jewes naturall branches, not ingrafted, and the scope of the Apostle is otherwise, as hath been shewed: *Examen*, pag. 65. But the chiefe difference is about the ingrafting what that is, as I had said. *The ingrafting to me is meant of the invisible Church by election*  
and



and faith. To this Master Marshall pag. 136. sayes, I reply, if it be meant of the invisible Church only. and that all who are ingrafted in the Apostles sense whether Jews or Gentiles are only elect ones, I will promise you never to plead this Scripture more for any infants; and after if you please let us try it on.

I agree to this motion, and determine, that the grafting in Rom. 11. 17. &c. is meant of the ingrafting into the invisible Church by election and giving faith, with this caution; that I doe not deny that the same people might or were ingrafted into the visible Church by profession of faith, and baptisme; but hold that this ingrafting is more then that which is into the visible Church by outward profession and ordinances. To prove my determination, I thus argue.

1. That ingrafting which is Gods act by his sole power, is into the invisible Church by election and giving faith. For grafting into the invisible Church is as Mr Marshall saith, pag. 135. *admission in o visible membership*, which if it be by an outward ordinance, is the easie act of the administratour; if by profession of faith, the easie act of the professour. But the ingrafting meant Rom. 11. is Gods act from his sole power, as is proved from verse 23. where the reason is rendred why the Jewes should be again grafted in, is, because *God is able to graffe them in again*; *ergo*, the grafting here is into the invisible Church.

2. That ingrafting which is called reconciliation opposite to casting away, that is by election and giving faith; for no other acts can reconcile: but the ingrafting here is called *reconciliation opposite to casting away*. v. 15. as may appeare in that v. 16. is a reason of the clause about the reception of the Jewes, v. 15. and the 17 verse, is an admonition from the supposition, v. 15. that the Jewes were cast away; which is called breaking off, v. 17. now if breaking off, v. 17. be the same with casting away, v. 15. then ingrafting is the same with reconciliation; *Ergo*, ingrafting is by election and giving of faith.

3. The ingrafting must bee meant of that act whereby the branch stand in the tree as a branch this will none deny, it being the very *terminus* of ingrafting; as heate the *terminus* of Calectation. But that is by giving faith. *Ergo*, The *minor* is proved from v. 20. where it is said, *by unbelief they were broken off but thou*

*An Apologie for the two Treatises*

*thou standest by faith*, whence I argue. That act whereby the branch stands in the tree as a branch, must be the giving that meanes whereby the branch thus stands, but that is faith, v. 20. *Ergo*, the act of ingrafting is by giving of faith.

4. That ingrafting is meant v. 17. whereby the *wild olive is Copartaker of the root and founesse of the olive tree*, as is asserted there. But such is only election and giving of faith. *Ergo*, The *minor* I prove by considering who the root is, and what the founesse of the olive tree is. 1. Negatively, the root is not as Master Marshall and Master Blake, *every beleeving parent*. For then all the branches should be naturall; the child of every beleeving parent is a naturall branch from his father: but here the Apostle makes the Gentiles branches, and a wild olive grafted in besides nature, and the Jewes only naturall branches growing from the root, v. 21. 24. Nor is it of any moment which is objected, that other parents are called roots as *Jesse*, *Itai*. 11. 1. For here only the root notes such a Father as is holy, and from whom the branches are holy; which agrees not to every beleeving Father. 2. Positively. The root is no other then *Abraham*. I said twice in my *Examen*, pag. 68. 129. *Abraham only is a holy root, or at most Abraham Isaac and Iacob*; which I said only by concession: that if it were so, yet every godly parent was not a holy root, and therefore it served my turn there, if it were so. This Mr Marshall pag. 134. calls; *saying, and unsaying*. But Mr Marshall might have considered that I did in that addition only mention the judgement of others, and not contradicted it there where it was not against my purpose if it were granted; but otherwise, where I expresse my owne judgement, I mention only *Abraham* as the root, *Exercit.* pag. 10. *Examen*, pag. 64, 65. And see doe *Deodae* annot. on v. 16, 17. The new Annot. on v. 16. *Beza* on v. 17. *Neque dubium est, quin radicis nomine intelligatur, Abraham credentium pater*. Which contains the reason of this opinion. For he must be the root who is a Father both to Jewes and Gentiles, who are also branches in this root, *the root is said to beare them*, v. 18. But we read not this of any other then of *Abraham* called *the Father of the faithfull*. *Rom.* 4. 11. and the Gentile beleevers *his seed*, *Rom.* 4. 13. 16. *Gal.* 3. 29. no where are these things said of *Isaac*, and *Iacob*. It is said indeed that the Jewes are *be-*  
*ved,*



*ved dāni's partur*, for the Fathers either because of the Covenant made with them, or because of the favour God bare them; as often he is said to reserve a lamp in *Judah* for *Dauid's* sake, but this speech hath speciall respect to the Jewes, whereas the benefit of the root, v. 17. 18. is common to Gentiles and Jewes. As for the fatnes of the olive tree *Deodate* saith truly, it is the blessing and promise made to *Abraham* & his seed, & to the Apostle expresth it, *Gal. 3. 14.* And it would be too frigid, and washy an exposition to expound it of outward priviledges, & ordinances. Yea it were false, for the Gentiles were not partaker of the outward priviledges and ordinances of *Abraham* and the Jewes they being taken away. Now these things being put it multneeds be, that this ingrafting must be by giving faith, sith by faith only the Gentiles are partakers of the root *Abraham*, and the fatnesse of the olive tree the beleeving Church, not by naturall generation of beleeving parents, nor by outward administrations. *Ergo*, the ingrafting here into the invisible Church is by election and giving of faith.

5. From verse 2. If the breaking off the Jewes be by blinding, then the ingrafting is by giving faith, but the former is true, verse 25. *Ergo*, the latter.

6. If reingrafting of the Jewes produceth salvation, is by turning them from iniquity, taking away their sins according to Gods Covenant, then it is into the invisible Church by giving faith, but the former is true, verse 26, 27. *Ergo*, the latter.

7. If the reingrafting be by vertue of Gods election and love, his gifts of calling then it is into the invisible Church by election and giving faith, but the former is true v. 28, 29. *Ergo*, the latter.

8. If the ingrafting both of Jewes and Gentiles be the fruit of gods mercy, the breaking off by shutting up in unbeleeffe, then the ingrafting is into the invisible Church by election and giving faith, but the former is true, verse 30, 31, 32. *Ergo*, the latter.

What should I say more? It is so plaine from the whole scope and tenour of the Apostles words, that the ingrafting there spoken of is into the invisible Church by election and giving faith, that from the first verse of the chapter to verse 13. there is scarce a verse but speaks of rejecting, foreknowing, election, grace, hardning, giving a spirit of slumber, darkning the eyes, stumbling, falling or some equipollent terme to these, and the Apostle doth plainly

plainly signify his intention in all that discourse to be the shewing the mystery of Gods counsell in electing, reprobating, blinding, converting one while the Jewes, another while the Gentiles; so that I cannot but admire, that Mr Marshall should interpret the ingrafting of bare admission into visible Church-membership.

9. Adde hereto. The places which I conceive answer to Rom. 11. 17. must be understood of the invisible Church as Eph. 3. 6. 1 Cor. 12. 13. Gal. 3. 14. 26. 28. 29. Lastly for testimonies of interpreters I find but two in *Marlorats Cathol. Exposition* on Rom. 11. 17. and they have these words. *Hyperius. Neque enim hic amplius docet, sed orationem totam ad Gentes convertens sapienter monet, ne propter electionem suam efferantur, aut Judaeos quia rejecti sunt contemnant: maxime quum & Judaeorum plurimi salutem sint adhuc per Evangelium consequuturi, Gentes verò iterum possent, si Deo ita visum foret reprobari. Bucer. Insitus fuisti illis] Hoc beneficium est quod Gen.ibus per Judaeos contigit. Gentes enim per fidem Christi factae sunt semen Abraham Gal. 3. 29. Ergo, insita Indaeis, ut gratia sanctis patribus promissa, & fruantur, & spiritu illorum vivant: id quod Apostolus per communionem radicis & pinguedinis significat. ut namque filii Dei omnes eadem Dei benevolentia vituantur, ita eorum spiritu aguntur, etiamsi hic donetur grandior post revelatum Christum. Hic verò ex praecipuis locis est ex quibus probatur eodem spiritu vera justitia donatos fuisse Judaeos ante incarnatum Christum. Calvin ad vers. 20. nam erectio Judaeorum, si ob incredulitatem facta est, Gentium insitio per fidem, quid restat nisi ut Dei gratiam recognoscendo inde ad modestiam ac submissionem formentur.* And this I thought so plain, that I conceived Mr Marshall himselfe so expounded it in his sermon pag. 43. in these words. *It being the primary intention of the Covenant of Grace, in it's first work, to shew what free grace can and will doe to miserable nothing, to cut miserable man off from the wild olive, and graffe him into the true olive, to take away the heart of stone, to create in them a heart of flesh, &c.* which thing hee saith nothing to in his Defence, though I alleaged it pag. 64. of my *Examen*, except it be that he meant the words he useth pag. 137 of his Defence, alleaging that I say, *insitio* (not *incision* as it is printed in Mr Marshall's Defence) may be either into the visible or invisible Church, grassing in, may be either by faith or by profession of faith;



faith, and therefore I say the same with him, should be to tell me that he can bring as much from my words for him as I bring from his words for me, which conceit is but vain; for my words are nothing but the opening the distinction of the various kind of ingrafting; no assertion in those words what insition is meant, *Rom. 11. 17.* and for the words Mr Marshall alleageth out of my *Examen*, pag. 65. of which he saith. *And truly Sir, in these words to my understanding, you grant not only my interpretation of this place, but even the question controverted betwixt us.* I shall shew to be a mistake in answering his objection against the interpretation I give of the ingrafting into the invisible Church, having first observed that Master Gerees words in his *vindic. padob. pt smi* confirme my interpretation against his owne in the Chapter next before, when he saith, *Chap. 1. Sect. 4. pag. 19. The holines there is meant not actuall holinesse, but potentiall in regard of Gods election.* And Mr Blake, pag. 94. we by faith are grafted in for them, *Rom. 20.* The onely objection of waight is, that then some branches of the invisible Church may be broken off, and so election made revocable, and Apostasy from grace maintained: and hereupon Mr Marshall accuseth me as symbolizing with *Arminius*, and puts this in the margine of his book, pag. 144. and in the *Index*: and thereby thinks to cut scores with me for accusing him as *symbolizing with Arminius*, pag. 69. of my *Examen*.

To which I answer. 1. That there is a wide difference between Mr Marshals case and mine. I shew that Mr Marshals tenet agrees with *Arminius* his tenet, and I quote *Arminius* his words in the margine; and therein I did justly. For *Arminius* also understood his speech of outward administrations, to wit the preaching of the Gospell, in the end of his *Anti-perkins*, and both Mr Marshall and *Arminius* agree, that the infants of the wicked for these outward dispensations are comprehended in their parents according to the tenour of Gods justtce. But I expressly rejected the tenet of *Arminius* about revocable election, and Apostasy from grace; which if they should follow from my interpretation, I conceiving otherwise, yet were not I to be charged with symbolizing with *Arminius*, as Mr Marshall doth in his professed tenet. 2. But I conceived I had prevented this objection, pag. 64. of my *Examen*, at those words. The meaning is not that some of the;

*An Apologie for the two Treatises*

*branches in the invisible Church may be broken off, but only such as were so in appearance; and I alleaged John 15. 2. as an instance of the like expression: shewing in that very similitude, that the word branch in Christ is sometimes meant of that which is so in appearance, & sometimes of that which is so in truth; and so in like manner it may be used, Rom. 11. 17. And thus Chamier, tom. 3. panstrat. Cathol. l. 13. c. 21. answers Bellarmine; urging John. 15. 2. for falling away from faith. But Mr Marshall tells me, I professe I understand not how this distinction gives you the least help. I reply, that it plainly avoyds the consequence objected against my interpretation; for though the branches in one passage be meant of the branches in appearance, and the breaking off that which was so in appearance, yet, other places, as in the same verse in the ingrafting may be meant of true ingrafting into the invisible Church in like manner, as it is John 15. 2. But because upon more accurate examination I conceive that is not the genuine answer, I shall therefore let it passe. 3. I say, when the Apostle saith the branches were broken off, he meanes it of the branches that were truly such, and of the ingrafting that was truly such into the invisible Church, but that by the branches are not meant singular persons; but the people, or as M. Mar. speaks p. 137. the body of them were the branches spoken of in this place, & M. Gereau p. 16. Nor is it either the Arminians tenet, or any error to say that the body of a people which were once the elect people of God, and ingrafted into the invisible Church, because the generality or a greater number were such among that people, are broken off from election, and the invisible Church. For a people or nation is not a consistent being, but a fluent being as a river, which is the same river still, though not the same water; and therefore as when Cyrus turned Euphrates from it's own channell, hee may bee said to have turned away the same river Euphrates that was created at first though it were not the same numerically water; so when God rejected the Jews from being his elect, beleeving people he broke off the same people that were the true branches of Abraham the true root in the invisible Church, and yet no one particular person, who was elect or in the invisible Church by faith broken off, which is the Arminian doctrine. And this I find observed by each of the three Authors alleaged before from Marlorat. Hyperius at v. 21. is thus alleaged;*



alleged; speaking. *Quemadmodum nunc rejectus est populus Iudaicus, qui tamen electus fuerat: ita potest adhuc fieri, ut aliquando rejiciatur populus Gentilis, qui nunc electus est; alioquin singulos electos de populo Iudaico, vel de populo Gentili reprobari impossibile planè est. Ad hunc (inquam) modum si quicquid de ruina metuenda electis sequitur, non de singulis electis, sed de populo ex quo descendunt interpreteris, multis te molestiis liberaveris.* Calvin ad verbe 21. præcipue verò notandum Pauli sermonem non tam ad singulos homines, quam ad totum Gentium corpus dirigi. Bucer ad verbe 22. *De Gentibus loquitur universim non de singulis hominibus.* And indeed the text leads me to this interpretation. For when it is said, verse 23, 24. *that they shall be grafted in, God is able to graffe them in again; these which are according to nature; shall be grafted in their own olive; which cannot be understood of the same person, but of the same people.*

Thus have I besides my first purpose put into this *Apology* this large dissertation about *Rom. 11. 16, 17. &c.* partly because by Mr *Gerees* conference with me and another, and his words to me; *Vindic. padobap. pag. 17. I commend this Scripture to your serious consideration, for I conceive it gives clear evidence to what I affirm; I perceive this text is his chiefe hold for Infant-baptism, and in Mr Blakes new answer to my Examen, pag. 69. I find these words; your examination, Rom. 11. 16. hath been under examination, and if there be strength in those exceptions, there is weaknesse no where.*

Mr *Blake* in his answer to my letter, pag. 30. saith thus. *If the ingrafting bee by saving faith onely, to derive saving grace personally inherent as a fruit of election from Abraham; then it must be that we are elect in Abraham, Abraham may say without me yee can doe nothing, &c.* I answer, if I made *Abraham* a root as communicating faith by infusion, or impetration mediatory as *Christ*, this would follow; but I make *Abraham* onely a root as he is called the Father of all them that beleeve, *Rom. 4. 11.* not by begetting faith in them, but as an exemplary cause of beleeving, as I gather from the expression. verse 12. that he is a Father to them that walk in the steps of our Father *Abraham*, which he had yet being uncircumcised.

Mr *Blake* *ibid.* pag. 31. *what made Abraham, Isaac and Jacob*

# An Apologie for the two Treatises

roots (as in nature, so holy roots) but the Covenant? And was not the Covenant made as well with David, as with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. I answer, I make Abraham only the root, as hee is only the Father of beleevers exemplarily, and that which made him the Father of beleevers was not the Covenant, but his exemplary faith, as I gather from the words of the Apostle, *Rom. 4. 16, 17, 18, 19. 21.* And this is all the accession of strength I find him opposing to my so manifest weaknesse. The rest is answered already.

S. 15.  
of M. Marshalls  
unjust charge  
against me as  
darkning his  
arguments...  
and casting  
s'ch in the  
face of the  
Assembly.

Mr Marshall pag. 124. sayes, *I raise a dust about his argument*, because I tell him he doth not distinctly expresse what the promise is, *Acts 2. 39.* and I require of him to forme his proofes into an argument, as if it were unreasonable to require him to make a syllogisme in mood and figure in a Sermon. And yet hee did make diverse in that Sermon, as pag. 39, 41. But it seems neither then nor since is he willing to tell what promise that is, *Acts 2. 39* and then conclude syllogistically; for then it would plainly appear that that text serves not his purpose, who in his second conclusion will not affirm that the promise of saving grace is made to the natural seed of beleevers; and yet that text speaks of the promise of Christ, and saving Grace by him. However I remember this was Doctor Pridmore's manner in Oxford, to require the disputant when he urged a text to read it, and then to gather his argument from it, and this I ever took to be a bringing of light, and not raising a dust about an argument. And I shall still professe it to be a very irksome thing to me to answer an author that will not do so, and till Mr Marshall doe it, I shall censure him as one that takes needless way to clear truth, but to darken it with multitude of words, among which words shall have much adoe to find the meaning and the conclusion.

Mr Marshall, pag. 147. accuses me of flattery, plundering, darkning his arguments of my adversaries. If he had told me wherein he thought me to please, that I might know how to amend my fault, hee would have done well. (as hee saith pag. 134) *For being as he saith, my arguments are darkned by my adversaries, I suppose in that I tell him that his arguments are darkned by his adversaries, and hee saith that it is plain that his arguments are darkned by his adversaries, and hee saith that it is plain that his arguments are darkned by his adversaries.*



rightly called by Logicians *lumen rationis*, and is the onely way to enlighten, not to darken speeches. And therefore all that are able in dispute, make this their chiefe businesse to distinguish termes, or things that differ; and then set down their conclusions, and frame their arguments and answers, which is the thing I would have Mr Marshall doe: Nor is my pretending obscurity in Marshall a kind of art to evade what cannot plainly be answered, as Mr Geree conceives, *vind. paedobap. ch. 1. sect. 3.* but a means to find out the force of the argument, that I might give it a plain answer.

Whereas I had framed the fifth argument in my exercitation thus. *That which in succeeding ages in which it was in use, was in force. 1. As a tradition not written. 2. Out of imitation of Jewish circumcision. 3. Without universall practise. 4. Together with the error of giving infants the Lords Supper, and many other humane inventions under the name of Apostolical traditions that is deservedly doubtfull, but such is Infant-baptisme; Ergo, Mr Marshall pag. 251. 252. tells me, this is a poor argument.* And yet such arguments have been accounted after other arguments from Scripture of great moment against Papists and Prelates, in rejecting of ceremonies. But how doth Mr Mar. answer this? He denies the major, which hath been accounted good in other points. And then because I make a severall prooffe of the severall parts of the minor: he repeats my words as if I had made a severall argument from each branch, and to make a shew of their weakness, puts in another argument and conclusion then mine, as like, with this inference. *Ergo, we are not bound to observe it, Ergo, it was not a duty, which were none of my conclusions.* And then sayes, *This kind of arguing is almost as wild as that which the schoolers call a *barale ad arguendum*, and the boys in the schoolers would stamp and hiss at such an inference.* I professe if I should in schoolers repeat my opponents arguments as Mr Marshall doth mine, I should allow the boys in the schoolers to stamp and hiss at such a prooffe. Mr Marshall pag. 124. hath these words. *The first part of our wonted equivocation of the word Covenant of Grace, being it only of the Covenant of saving grace, not including the outward way of administration with it.* This I had proved I was not bound to speak plainly without equivocation, but I was bound to say as Marshall did when I could plain speak without equivocation.

cation is equivocating with him. But what a ridiculous charge is this? It's equivocation when a word is taken in various senses. Is it equivocation in me to take the word *covenant of grace* only of the covenant of saving grace? This is like as if a man should be charged with speaking nonsense, because he speaks good reason in right language.

But I hope by this time the Reader doth understand who hath used sophistry in disputing, I or Master Marshall.

What I said of the *Assembly*, pag. 27. of my *Examen*, I did it not to cast filth in their face, as Master Marshall construed it; but as a brotherly intimation of my feares and apprehensions to make them cautelous, whose wise and faithfull deportment in that great trust reposed in them is of great moment to the whole Christian Church. Of whom I professe I am still jealous out of Love to them, that especially in this matter they are not so sensible as they should be of the truth of God, and the good of the Church. For which jealousie, and for what I said about wasting of time about inconsiderable things comparatively, I suppose I am able to give a sufficient account. And this I speake meerly to awaken them, and to prevent that inconsideratenes through an *excessive* passion, or such like cause usually befalls such meetings, and is the cause of much woe to the Church of God. Be it well or ill taken *liberavi animam meam meam*, I have freed my owne soule.

§ 16. Of Mr Marshall's untrue charge against me, as it I rested on Grotius in setting down the tenent of Antiquity upon occasion of which the tenent of Antiquity is again examined, my judgment of their doctrine vindicated, Mr. Marshall's new allegations answered, and my diligence to find out their tenets manifested.

There are some other things wherewith Mr Marshall endeavors to render me a suspected person, pag. 29. of his defence. I cannot but wonder, why you (who pretend to be familiarly acquainted with the secrets of Antiquity) should have so much correspondence with them who are not likely to helpe you with any certaine intelligence. Hugo Grotius is the strongest stake to support your tottering hedge; and since I am Grotius was a friend to the Socinians, and it is well knowne what they thinke of Baptisme. To this I answer, it is untrue that I any where pretend to be familiarly acquainted with the secrets of Antiquity. I say, so farre as I can by search find it is thus and thus, but never did take upon me familiar acquaintance with the secrets of Antiquity. It seemes Master Marshall had the helpe of his friend, and so there was a Colledge to answer my Booke, yet after he and his friend have done all they could in this point, it doth not yet appeare but that I was in the right



right, to wit that Infant baptisme is not so ancient as is pretended. For he hath not yet acquitted the treatise of questions ad Orthodoxos from bastardy; nor hath he answered that which I said that the words and whole scope of Irenaeus, lib. 2. c. 39. shew that the place is not meant of Baptisme: but with a new device, such as it concerns the authors conscience to looke to, when he is told the words and whole scope shew that the place is not meant of Baptisme; in which I chiefly alleaged the words, the answerer saies nothing to that, but maimedly sets downe my words thus. In the last place you labour to prove that it is not meant of Baptisme from Irenaeus his scope in that place. And then sayes that though the scope be so, yet the words prove the question in debate before us. Which is a manifest abusing the reader, never answering the reason I gave from the very words and whole scope, that they could not be understood of the rite of Baptisme. And for Origen all that is yet brought cannot acquit the passages alleaged from suspicion of being supposititious, considering that Origen is taxed for Pelagianizing, whereas those words are point-blanke against them, which being observed by me, the answerer thought it wisedome to say nothing to it. And for the rest of the testimonies Master Marshall brought, I did confesse Nazsanzon, Cyprian, Augustin, Hierom, Ambrose mention Pædobaptisme, but never upon Mr Marshall's ground federal holines, but upon a supposed necessity to save the Infant from perishing.

Master Marshall it seems rests much on Augustines words, that he saith. *Hoc Ecclesia semper habuit, semper tenuit, hoc a majorum fide accepit, hoc usque in finem perseveranter custodit*; He puts it therefore in the Title, pag. 55. of his Defence, and pag. 9. quotes for these wordes Augustin. Serm. 15. de verbis Apost. I have read over that Sermon tom. 10 of his workes againe and againe and find not thole wordes there, nor any to that purpose, I have also read Sermon 14. de verbis Apostoli, which hath the title de Baptismo parvulorum adversus Pelagianos, and I find not there those words; onely these I find there. *Sanctus Cyprianus est quem in manus sumpsi antiquus Episcopus sedis hujus, quid senserit de Baptismo parvulorum, immo quid semper Ecclesiam sensisse monstraverit paululum accipite*, I deny not but that those wordes may be in Augustine, but if Master Marshall had given me more

certaine direction where to find them, I might then perhaps have given a more direct answer. However for these reasons I conceive little cause to be moved with those words. First, because I find not that *Augustin* tooke it to be the tenet of the Church from any other ground, then the Epistle of *Cyprian*, 59. *ad Fidum*, concerning which he saith that *Cyprian* hath shewed how the Church hath alwayes held it, both in the words above cited tom. 10. Serm. 14. de verbis Apost. & tom. 7. lib. 2. de peccat merito & remiss. c. 5. & c. And yet he that reads that Epistle of *Cyprian* shall find *Cyprian* onely declaring the determination of the Council of 66 Bishops there mentioned, but nothing of the Churches alwayes holding it. Secondly, The famous story of the likelihood of cheating *Augustine* and the rest of the *African Bishops* with a supposititious Canon of the *Nicen Council* by three *Roman Bishops* to confirme Appeals to *Rome* from *Africa* in the case of *Apollinaris* doth methinkes shew, that *Augustin* might easily be mistaken about the tenet of the Church. Thirdly, The many speeches in *Augustin*, as Epist. 118, and elsewhere, and others of the Ancients, about Easter, Lent-fast, Episcopacy, infant Communion and other traditions which are not credited by Protestant, nor some of them by some Popish writers doe cleare him from arrogance, or impudence that should say there is no great reason to give so much credit to that large assertion of *Augustin* (if it be his) as Master *Marshall* and some others seem to give to it. Fourthly Those words of *Augustin* tom. 7. de peccat: merito & remissione, lib. 10. c. 34. Optime Puniri Christiani baptismum nihil aliud quam salutem & sacramentum corporis Christi nihil aliud quam vitam vocant. Unde nisi ex antiqua ut existimo, & Apostolica traditione, qua Ecclesie Christi institum tenent prater baptismum, & participationem Dominica mensa, non solum non ad regnum Dei sed nec ad salutem, & vitam eternam posse quengquam hominum pervenire, do methinkes evidenceth that *Augustin* sometimes called that the Churches tenet, which he gathered by conjecture from the practice of the *African Christians* knowne to him. But it will be said the *Pelagians* did not deny Infant baptism to have been the practice of the Church. I answer, nor do I deny that it was in *Augustines* time the practice of the *Latin and Greek Churches* to baptize Infants in case of necessity,



but that it was so from the beginning, and alwayes in the Church we do not find the Pelagians yeilded, yet did they not perhaps question it, either because they were carried away with that erroneous rule that what they saw every where practised, and found not when it began to take that for an Apostolicall tradition, or because of the tyranny of the present custome, which *Augustine* himselfe somewhere confesseth, that though he misliked, yet *liberius improbare non audeo*. But saith Master *Marshall* pag. 55. *I cannot but conceive it likely, that Augustines Ecclesia semper habuit, semper tenuit, should sway as much with the intelligent impartial Reader, as Master Tombes his non semper habuit, non semper tenuit* I grant it should and much more, yet the Authorities, and reasons I bring should be I account sufficient to weigh downe *Augustines* testimony.

I had said the determination mentioned by *Cyprian Epist. 59. ad Fidum*, as farre as I can by search find, is the spring head of Infant baptisme. Master *Blake* in his Answer to my letter, pag. 6. *I desire to know what colour of truth you can put upon those words.* I answer, the words are true without any colour put upon them, For I did not deny that I found Infant baptisme practised before, but that the determination of that council was the spring head, that is as *Examen*, pag. 16. the first determined rule, or Canon, by force of which it hath since continued in a streame, and this is true.

Having formerly searched for *Augustines* words so often alleaged for the practise of Infant baptisme, upon the publishing Master *Blakes* booke I found them, not as Master *Marshall* quotes it, *Serm. 15. de verbis Apostoli*, but as Master *Blake* cites it, *Ser. 10.* And upon reading of them, the thing that *Augustine* saith the Church alwayes had, held and keeps, seems not to me to be the practise of Infant baptisme, unlesse by consequence ( which in matter of history is not so cleare a prooffe ) but the doctrine of originall sin in Infants, which *Pelagians* denied, not the practise of baptizing Infants. For the words immediately before are *nemo ergo vobis susurret doctrinas alienas*. And these words are onely a passage in a Sermon *ad populum*, in which usually there is not such exactnes, as in other workes; & among those Sermons, which are not out of all question whether genuine. But that the Reader

*An Apologie for the two Treatises*

may judge of this testimony, I wil set down the words as I find the.

*Nullus hominum in ista qua ex Adam defluit massa mortalium, nullus omnino hominum non agrotus, nullus sine gratia Christi sanatus. Quid de parvulis pueris, si ex Adam agroti? nam et ipsi portantur ad Ecclesiam. Et si pedibus illuc currere non possunt, alienis pedibus currunt ut sanentur. Accommodat illis mater Ecclesia aliorum pedes ut veniant, aliorum cor ut credant, aliorum linguam ut fateantur: ut quoniam, quod agri sunt alio peccante prae-gravantur, sic cum hi sani sunt, alio pro eis confitente salventur. Nemo ergo vobis susurret doctrinas alienas. Hoc Ecclesia semper habuit, semper tenuit: hoc a majorum fide percepit: hoc usque in finem perseveranter custodit. Quoniam non est opus sanis medicus sed agrotantibus. Quid necessarium ergo habuit Infans Christum, si non agrotat? si sanus est quare per eos qui eum diligunt medicum querit? Si quando portantur Infantes, dicuntur omnino nullum propaginis habere peccatum, & veniunt ad Christum: quare non eis dicitur in Ecclesia, qui eos opportant ad Ecclesiam. Auferte hinc innocentes istos non est opus sanis medicus, sed male habentibus: non venit Christus vocare justos sed peccatores? nunquam dictum est sed nec aliquando dicitur. Which last words shew that Augustine spake these things not as an Historian from good records, but as in popular Sermons is wont, out of conjecture from common practise in his time. Certainly the last words Augustine could deliver on no other ground: This testimony then hath a weake basis. And me thinkes the testimony of Chamier panstrat: Cathol. rom. 4. lib. 5. c. 15. § 19. Denique hunc morem quis non videt ejus temporis esse, cum vix millesimus quisque baptizabatur non adultus, & in Catechumenis diligenter exercitus might serve to ballance Augustines testimony inconsistent with so many likelihoods to the contrary. Which testimony of Chamier Master Marshall might have vouchsaf'd to have taken notice of, though it was but in the Margin of my Booke.*

Nor hath Master Marshall or his friend yet it proved baptizing of Infants of beleevers, by reason of federall holinesse taught by the Ancients. Master Gerec puts a passage of Tertullian de anima, cap. 39. Ex seminis prerogativa procreari sanctos in his frontis-peece, and Master Marshall conceives me sick of it. I answer, I blesse God no truth makes me sicke, it would make me well to



see paedobaptisme proved either of Scripture, or primitive Antiquity. But for this testimony of *Tertullian* my stomacke was quickly eased of it, as finding not onely by reading, *Delacerta* his note on it, but also by considering the occasion and words going before that *ex seminis prerogativa* imports not federal holines, but holinesse, by reason of the freedom from that unholinesse in their procreation, which the infidels children had from the many grosse idolatrous superstitions, by which they were defiled, and as it were dedicated to the Devill. And I conceive *Hieromes* words to *Paulinus*, *Epist.* 153. cited by Master *Blake* in his answer to my letter, pag. 57. expounding thus *Tertullian*, *asserens sanctos dici fidelium filios, quod quasi candidati sunt fidei & nullis idololatria sordibus polluantur*, shew that in *Tertullian* the prerogative of seed, notes onely freedom from pollutions of Idolatry, at or before their birth, not covenant holinesse, and the word *candidatos fidei*, the same with *designatos sanctitatis* prove that they were holy in expectation, because in hope and intention believers, and so to be baptized. And though I find *Tertullians* words somewhat obscure, as all his writings are; yet in that he calls them *designatos sanctitatis* (which seems to be meant of baptisme) not onely *ex seminis prerogativa*, but also *ex institutionis disciplina*, which Master *Marshall* himselfe interprets of their education, pag. 73. of his defence, it seems plaine to me, that this place proves that *Tertullian* makes their Christian education the antecedent to the baptisme of beleivers children in his daies: and so this place makes against Master *Marshall*s tenet not for it.

It is true, the Ancients doe allusively call baptisme circumcision, as they do the Lords Table the Altar, the Lords Supper the Sacrifice, the Presbyters Priests, the Deacons Levites; nor do I deny that they say circumcision was a type of baptisme, (which Protestant writers grant not) and that they thereupon make baptism succeed circumcision, and they argue for baptizing of Infants from circumcision, this I granted in my exercitation and Examen. But yet I thinke neither Master *Marshall* nor his friend can shew that they argued thus, the Children of *Abraham* were circumcised by vertue of the Covenant, I will be thy God and the God of thy seed, therefore the children of beleivers onely are to be baptized by vertue of the Covenant. I find that they argued thus from

circumcision, *circumcision was the remedy against originall sinne, and the male that is not circumcised, shall be cut off from his people, so Baptisme is the remedy of originall sin, and by reason of it, the unbaptiz'd infant dying, shall bee damned.* But I thinke if Master Marshalls friend could, he would have shewed that they argued from federall holinesse of infants of beleeving parents, to the capacity of Baptisme; this I yet think is a late device, no elder then *Zuinglius* as I said in my *Examen*. And so my hedge is not yet tottering, but rather Mr Marshall's hedge, whereby hee fenceeth Infant-Baptisme either from Antiquity or Scripture is already so broken down, that a mean Scholler may goe through it; and if any truth-searching Scholler bee satisfied by Mr Marshalls writing, it is to me an amazement. 2. As for that which he saith, that *Grotius* is the strongest stake in my hedge, meaning in point of antiquity, therein Master Marshall is much deceived. For, 1. the chiefe stake in my hedge in point of antiquity is the observation upon what ground the Ancients taught Infant-Baptisme, which was not Covenant-holines, but supposed necessity to save the child from perishing; and the supposed power that Baptisme hath to give grace, which I gathered from *Cyprian*, *Augustin*, and others, but do not remember that I received it from any but by my own observation. 2. My hedge was in some sort made in my *Exercitation* before I ever took notice of any thing in *Grotius* about paedobaptisme, which was about the time I began to frame my *Examen* upon occasion of Mr Thomas Goodwin his citing his annotation upon *Matth. 19. 14.* where *Grotius* is so farre from being a stake in my hedge, that Doctor Homes, pag. 146. saith, that for *Grotius* his own opinion it is clear and full for Infant-Baptisme upon that 19 of *Matthem v. 14.* and therefore I suppose his testimony is the lesse to be suspected in this matter. I confesse that *Grotius* put me in mind of that of *Gregory Nazianzen*, which I find in the relation of his life, that though his Father were a Greeke Bishop, yet he remained unbaptized, till being sent to *Athens* to study; being at sea he was in danger of drowning: and being perplexed, that he was likely to dye being unbaptized; he resolved to be baptized when he came to shore. Mr Marshall askes how I prove his Father was a Christian when he was born? To this I answer, that I had thought Mr Marshall had not been ignorant, that this instance of *Gregory Nazianzen's*



*Nazianzen's* Father is brought by many Protestant writers against the Papists that deny marriage to the Clergy, to prove that then Bishops were married, and did use their wives. If Mr *Marshall* please, he may read what *Chamier panstrat: Cathol. tom. 3. lib. 10. c. 13. §. 10.* sayes of his father and mother.

I also found in *Grotius* the instance of *Chrysostome*, which I confesse I took upon his word as wanting books and time to read so much as was necessary to examine the matter, *Grotius* not directing whence he had it. But if that instance do not hold, the instance of *Hierome* is plain, whom *Erasmus* in his life proves out of his own writings to have been born of Christian parents in *Pannonia*, yet was baptized at *Rome*, whither he was sent to be taught the learning of that age.

The testimony of the *Councill of Neocæsarea* I did not remember till *Grotius* put me in mind of it; but I trusted not to his quotation only, but found the same in *Osiander* his *Epit. Eccles. Hist. Cent. 4. lib. 1. c. 21.* at the yeare 311. with this note; *Non intelligo quid sibi posterior hujus Canonis pars velit.* As for the words they are so plain, that Mr *Marshalls* evasions are but shifts. For though it be true that the *Canon* was only about children in the womb, yet the reason of their not baptizing, is not either because they were not yet born, or sureties could not undertake for them, but because in the confession in baptism, every ones free choice is shewed. Which plainly declares that *Councill* held that none were to be baptized, but such as shewed their own free choice by confession. As for *Balsamon* and *Zonaras* it is true that I have not read them but taken their testimony from *Grotius*, because the testimony of the *Councill of Neocæsarea*, ancienter then the first *Nicene* was the thing alieaged, *Balsamon* and *Zonaras* were only glossers; yet Mr *Marshall* sayes nothing to *Zonaras*, and what he brings in answer to *Balsamons* glosse is nothing to the purpose. For neither did *Grotius* nor I say that *Balsamon* denied Infant-Baptisme according to his own opinion, but that from that canon *Balsamon* and *Zonaras*, do infer that an infans cannot be baptized because it hath not power to choose the confession of Divine Baptisme, which is all one with that which Mr *Marshall* himselfe saith, pag. 31. There is required of him that would professe himselfe a follower of Christ (as *Zonaras* expounds the last words of the Canon) a free election:

An Apologie for the two Treatises

or (as Balsamon hath it) there is required of everyone in Baptisme his own promise, which an infant in its mothers wombe cannot doe. And can an infant out of the mothers womb do it? so that it is plain even by Mr Marshalls own explication of the Canon, that that Council held that those were only to be baptized, that could make a promise themselves. I doubt not but that this Council allowed Baptisme of infants, as Nazianzen did in case of danger of death, but I think it is plain that out of that case they allowed not the baptisme of an infant, no not though a beleevers infant; till the child could make its own confession: as appears from their scrupling the baptizing of the mother converted now with child, lest it should be taken to reach to the child in the womb, and from the generall reason, that everyone manifests his own free choice in confession. And I am perswaded that this was the true state of Baptisme in those dayes, in the Greek and Latin Church; that they did baptize all sorts of infants whether of beleevers or unbeleevers, in case of danger of death; least they should perish for want of it; in which case Lay-persons did baptize: and Augustine contra epist. Parmeniani, cap. 13. lib. 2. saith, *si autem necessitas urgeat, aut nullum, aut veniale delictum est*. But otherwise they baptized not ordinarily, till they came to years to make their own confession. The cases of Nazianzen, Augustine, and Hierome, Constantine the great, and others; and their solemn baptizing onely at Easter and Whitsuntide, which is observed in the Rubrick of the English Liturgy, methinks should abundantly satisfie men concerning this truth. I cited likewise Grotius his speech of many of the Greekes, who in every age even to this day, doe keep the custome of deferring the Baptisme of little ones, till they could themselves make a confession of their faith. For which words though he cite no Authour, yet I presume Grotius, who is even by Spanheimius, often stiled *vir summus*; would not have said it, unlesse he had some ground for it. Mr Marshall sayes, I might blush for justifying the Anabaptists, in saying that the Ancients, especially the Greeke Church have rejected the baptisme of infants for many hundred yeares; meaning in the first ages after Christ. But as yet, neither Mr Marshall nor his friend have shewed me sufficient reason why I should retract it. For what he brings out of Photinus and Balsamon, men of much later standing about the later Canons.



Canons, and Imperiall lawes of the Greekes; and one of the 8 Canons concluded in Carthage against the Pelagians, requiring infants to be baptized: proves not, but that the Greeke Church rejected baptizing of infants many hundred of years in the first ages; nor doth it overthrow that of Grotius, that many of the Greekes (he doth not say the Greeke Church) in every age to this day doe keep the custome of deferring the baptizing of little ones, till they could themselves make a confession of their faith. Yea, the lawes brought by Mr Marshall rather prove it. For why should lawes be made for it, but because many did neglect it? And the story out of Balsamon about captives of Christians, rather shewes that some were not baptized, when little ones even among Christians, because they determine if there were no witnesses to prove their Baptisme, though children of Christians; they should bee baptized.

As for Grotius his being a friend to the Socinians, it is nothing to me, who knew not Grotius nor his wayes; nor ever pleaded for him. Yet I remember I have read that though he was accused thereof long agoe by Ravenspergerius, hee was justified by Vossius, and what ever Rivet, Marefius, Laurentius, charge him with, yet his works have a place among the learned, and may be read and made use of *cum judicio*, at least as the works of Papists, Lutherans, Prelatists, &c. who yet may be tainted with errors. Even Theophilus Philokyriades, Loncardiensis; if I mistake not Master Marshall's friend, doth in the very title page of his *Dies Dominica*, and in the book make use of Baronius his testimony in his *Annals*, an authour and work as much excepted against as Grotius. Nor doe I find that in that wherein I made use of Grotius, he hath deceived me; or I or he wronged the truth, or our Reader.

Mr Marshall pag. 54. of his *Defence* saith, that he perceived I have made great use in this controversy of an Arminian booke commonly knowne by the names of  *censura censura*. Whereas I never read the booke or made any use of it, till I read this passage in Mr Marshall's *Defence*. But since I confesse I have read chapter 23 of it, and am by that I find there the more confirmed in that truth, wherein I concurre with that Authour: though the truth is the chiefe light I had for antiquity in this matter, was some little reading of my own, and that which I read in Vossius his *theses theol: de paedobaptismo*.

N

But

## An Apologie for the two Treatises

But because Mr. Marshall hath accused me as having correspondencie with them who are not likely to help me with any certain intelligence, that it may appeare that I used what diligence I could to get most certain intelligence when I applyed my selfe to answer Mr. Marshall's Sermon, I presumed to write this ensuing letter, to that famous learned Gentleman, Mr. John Selden, of the Inner Temple.

Clarissime Vir,

**I**Nter theologorum placita hac obtinent, baptismum Ioannis & Christi circumcisiōni Judaica succedere, ejusq; locum occupare; atq; inde paedobaptismi ritum deduci. Mihi verò cum de paedobaptismi origine, tum de successione baptismi in locum circumcisiōnis an vera tradant Theologi isti, gravis diu insedit dubitatio. Baptismi enim institutum longè aliud esse à circumcisiōne, & paedobaptismum in Ecclesiis Christianis non nisi in seculo post Apostolos secundo obtinuisse plurima suadent. Inter alia verò istud urget, quod legerim alicubi (quanquam libris jam spoliatus locum judicare nequeam) baptismi ritum fuisse satis notum ante Joannis Baptistæ tempora in admissione Proselytorum aut Discipulorum apud Judæos, & interrogatio Phariseorum non de novitate ritus sed de auctoritate baptizantis querentium, Joannis Evangelii cap. 1. Com. 25. idem innuere videtur. Et forsitan temporis illius iudicium impetum inducit meum verum, apud eundem cap. 3. Com. 25. ad usurpationem istius ritus spectabat. Paedobaptismum verò ignotum fuisse primævis Ecclesiarum Christianarum temporibus asserit Ludovicus Vives comment in Augustini de civitate Dei lib. 1. cap. 27. Quapropter vir ornatissime, super istis apicibus doctrinae successione scilicet baptismi in locum circumcisiōnis, & paedobaptismi origine, te (cujus peritia in rebus & scriptis Hebraicis & Ecclesiasticis, veritatis amor, animique candor satis spectantur, & late prædicantur) consulendum duxi. Placeat itaque claritudini tuæ mihi quanquam obscuro verbum super tamam, tanquam juveni, suum, & officium, super istare animi sententiam tu imperare. Et quoniam sat scio te plurimis iisque gravissimis negotiis occupari responsum tuum, seu pluribus, seu paucioribus verbis tempore à te ipso posito expectabis.

Londini in ædibus Rectoris Ecclesiæ

Sancti Pauli in vicinis ejusdem

dominis Augusti

Dignitatis vestre obser-

vantissimus,

JOANNE SOTOMBEIS.

Though



aid Though the answer was no other then a reference of me to the books I might meet with in Stationers shops, yet I conceived this advantage I had by it, that what I found in books extant might be the more safely relyed on, and that my diligence to discover the truth would be the more apparent, for which I denied my selfe reit; and without recompense from men, layd out more then my estate could beare.

But M. Mar. seems ready to catch at any thing that may make me suspected, and so bring my writing out of credit; & p. 78. of his *Defence*, thus he speaks. *I am misinformed by good friends who know & love you very well if your self incline not this way to baptize any, whether Turks or Heathens, who onely would make a profession of their faith in Iesus Christ, & then admit them to al other ordinances, & not have them excommunicated à sacris, but onely à privato consortio; thought their lives should prove scandalous.* To which I say, that I deny not, but that in private conferēce lamenting the sad condition of these nations, that are likely to cut one anothers throats about the differences between *Presbyterians & Independents*; I have said that I doubted whether ever excommunication à sacris, or the *Presbyterian* or *Independent* Ecclesiasticall government, would be proved to be *Jure Divino* by Christs appointment. And I confesse that I take it to be but a matter of prudence, whether each congregation have it's compleat power and order within it selfe, or that it bee ordered in some things by an assembly of select persons out of divers congregations, and whether congregations and pastours be fixed, or unfixed. And I doubt whether the power of the *keyes*, *Matth. 16. 19.* be any other then doctrinall; whether *Matth. 18 15, 16, 17, 18.* contain any other direction then about particular injuries between brother and brother, or *let him be to thee a heathen and a publican*; be any other then shunning familiar converse: whether *1 Cor. 5. 2.* the mourning that the incestuous person might be taken away from among them, was any other then upon solemn fasting and prayer by the whole Church of *Corinth*, out of a holy zeale to Gods glory by Anathema curse or imprecation, to imprecate the vengeance of God upon him for the injury hee had done to God, and the Christian profession; that he might be taken away from them by God, and whether the delivery to *Satan* were any other then an act of Apostolicall power, or such as like them

§ 17. Of my opinion about excommunication, Church-government, the admission unto all ordinances, my former conformity, alleaged to alienate mens minds from me and my writings.

had power over unclean spirits tending to the taking away his naturall life, as *Molinaus* in his *Valed.* And I conceive the Apostle verse 9, 10, 11, 12. of that chapter, proceeds from that particular occasion to generall directions concerning the declining society with them that are vitious: which directions are manifestly concerning arbitrary and voluntary society in civill things, such as in a sort in some case they might afford to infidels, and then concludes. *And ye shall put away from among your selves that wicked one,* which as *Ainsworth* observeth on *Deut.* 17. 7. are the same words that the Greeke useth, *Deut.* 17. 7 and in like manner, *Deut.* 22. 21. 22. 24. noting the event of executing judgement by killing, whereby the guilty person and the guilt of his transgression was removed from them. And in reference to the incestuous person it notes the consequent of *their mourning that he might be taken away from them*, v. 2. not by such a processe as is either used in Episcopall Courts, or Presbyteriall Consistories; or Congregational meetings (though I think this last way comes nearest to it of any of the three) by convening, trying, hearing witnesses, and then pronouncing a judicall sentence according to the determination of one or more by plurality of votes, but by a solemn detestation of the fact, mourning for it, and with joint commotion and concurrence of spirit complaining of it to God, and imploring his vengeance to cut him off, and so to vindicate his own name and people. Which I conceive the Lord did then in an extraordinary way, when they had no Christian Magistrate or other power to avenge that injury to God and his people, in that Church which was endued abundantly with speciall gifts, 1 Cor. 1. 7. 1 Cor. 12. 1 Cor. 14. Which fact, I for my part doubt how it can be made the foundation of an ordinary meer Ecclesiasticall judgement, with jurisdiction as superiours that claime authority without speciall gift, in the time wherein a Christian Magistrate is ready to execute judgement on such offenders, any more than the fact, *Judg.* 20. of the whole congregation of Israel, in avenging the fact of the men of Gibeon, when there was no King in Israel, might be drawn into example for an ordinary practise when they had Judges, much less how hence may be concluded any such thing, as power of suspension from the Lords supper for every emergent scandal so judged by a congregation, or congrega-



gregationall Presbytery. Nor doth the Church loose by having a Christian Magistrate, if that jurisdiction be wanting; sith I suppose it is better provided for by the constant care of a christian Magistrate, if conscientious in executing judgement: if not, such censures have been seldome executed with conscience, or good effect. And though it be, that many magnifie the vertue and benefite of their juridical excommunication, yet the best intelligence I have, makes me question whether it hath not been rather an engine of much harme, as being used rather against dissenters in opinion, and opposers of profit, then men openly vitious, mannagers of that censure generally shewing themselves irreconcilable to them that dissent from them, but favourable enough to vitious living. Neverthelesse I deny not, but that there is a discipline proper to the Church, as namely in case of erroneous doctrine, and superstitious practise, contrary to the christian faith or worship according to the practise *Acts 15.* and command, *Tit. 3. 10.* *Rev. 2. 14. 20.* and in case of vitious life according to the scriptures, *1 Tim. 5. 20.* *2 Thess. 3. 6. 14, 15.* *1 Cor. 5. 9, 10, 11.* And if any assembly of Ministers and Rulers bee set up for the better discovery of such, that a person be not charged with those evils upon uncertain reports; I think it agreeable to Gods will, *1 Tim. 5. 19.* And if it happen that any such facts be perpetrated as are like to that of the incestuous person: I doubt not but the whole Church may and ought to disclaime the person so offending, and to exclude him from all brotherly communion, because I conceive so much was done to the incestuous person, as I gather from *1 Cor. 2. 6, 7.* yet herein they did not act as Judges that had power of jurisdiction over him, but as Physicians out of charity seeking to cure him. And I suppose in the manner of doing these things, we have not certain precise direction from Gods word, but that we are left free by God to order such things though pertaining to christians as christians by alterable rules of prudence. And thus farre I have thought good to expresse my selfe in this matter, because of *Mr Marshalls* words tending to render me suspected as if I did *monstrari aliquid alene*, nourse some monster.

As for my opinion about baptizing, I have publiquely declared when I examined whether to winble Church-membership were necessary reall sanctity in the judgement of Church-officers, that

by profession sufficient to it, I mean a profession of repentance and faith in Christ, which is *serious, sober, free, and understanding*; but denied that it is necessary there should be a further probation by trying mens spirits, so as to satisfie the particular congregation or Church-officers; that a person be admitted to Church-membership, and the Lords Supper. I confesse such triall is requisite in admitting into speciall function, or intimate society; but not to communion in worship. And my opinion is, that as much is required to make capable of baptisme, as of the Lords Supper; and that being admitted to the one, if rightly performed, they are not to be debarred of the other, for want of a further triall of their spirits. And though I never said that *by rectifying Baptisme, all the abuses I mention following padobaptisme would be removed* (for I did not make padobaptisme the sole or principall cause of them, that is mans corruption, which will fall into those or the like in some measure, if padobaptisme were removed) yet it is true which I said in my *Examen, part. 2. §. 7. the onely way to further reformation, is to begin in a regular way at the purging of that Ordinance of Jesus Christ, to wit Baptisme*. Even as though all ignorance and superstition were not removed by removing Latin Service, yet that was the onely regular way to begin at the removing it. And it is easie to conceive, that forasmuch as the grosse ignorance of people is much occasioned by their baptizing afore they know, that if they were not baptized till they knew christian Religion, as it was in the first ages, grosse ignorance in christian professours would be almost wholly reformed, and for christian walking, if baptisme were administred with a solemn abrenunciation, profession and promise by the baptized in his own person, & upon that were baptized, I doubt not but it would have more aw on mens consciences then many other means used or devised, considering how in the primitive times men differred baptisme for feare they might not enjoy their lusts, and they were counted by some as guilty of inexpressible crime that fell away after baptisme: and on the other side, infant-baptisme is the ground upon which innumerable people ignorant and profane harden themselves as if they were good christians, regenerate, and should be saved without holinesse of life, never owning or considering any profession or promise made for them as theirs.

There



There have been other suggestions hinted by Mr Gere, but amplified in clancular whisperings concerning my former conformity to ceremonies and Episcopall government, which are carried about in private to render me a person suspected, and to lessen the credit of my writing, the chiefe part of which I have answered in my Sermon intituled *Fermentum Pharisaeorum*; and the time, end, necessity, manner, and circumstances in doing what I did, being pleas sufficient to acquit me, and the things not belonging to the present cause, but being fitter for private audience. I will trouble the Reader no further with my Apology, assuring my selfe that setting aside this opinion of paedobaptisme and common infirmities, my life, labours doctrine even in the judgement of those that dissent from me, and knew me, will abundantly answer for me against all clancular whisperings whatsoever.

And concerning my two treatises, notwithstanding Mr Ley's censure passed perhaps afore he had compared mine and my Antagonists writings together; I may rather say, *that by my two treatises there is such a wound given already to Infant-baptisme, that however men may play the Mountebanks and skin it over, it will never be cured at the bottome.* For in point of antiquity it still stands good which I asserted; *That Infant-baptisme is not so ancient as is pretended, as now taught, is a late Innovation;* that a great number of those that sought reformation in the thirteenth Century, opposed infant-baptisme; that the doctrine of Anti-paedobaptisme neither undermines Magistracy, Ministry, Lords day, nor any true interest of the infants of beleivers, that the argument from the Covenant to the Seate, is either a tautology, or invalid without a command; that the Covenant made with *Abraham*, *Gen. 17.* was a *mixed Covenant* having in it not onely promises of spirituall benenits common to all beleivers, but also peculiar promises concerning things temporall; that *Acts 2. 39.* being meant of Christ and saving benefits by him; as *Master Marshall* confesseth cannot serve *Master Marshalls* turn to prove his second conclusion which he denies to be meant of the promise of saving grace, as if it were made to beleivers and their naturall seed. As for *Master Marshalls* paraphrase, which he calls *argument*, pag. 129. 130. of his *Defence*; I think it to bee most absurd in that it makes the promise, *Acts 2. 39.* when applied to the Fathersto be

§ 18. Of the vanity of Mr Ley's vaunt concerning the deadly wound given to my cause, and the contrary demonstrated by a brieft going through the principall points about this argument, as they have hitherto been disputed. As about *Acts 2. 39.* *Rom. 11. 16.* *1 Cor. 7. 14.* *Colos. 2. 12.* *Matth. 28. 19.* *Acts 16, 15.* *Matth. 19. 14.* &c.

*An Apologie for the two Treatises*

be meant of justification, when to the children, of outward administrations; nor so expounded are the words true: there being no such promise. That *Rom. 11. 16. &c.* proves not that there is the same Church state in the Churches of the Gentiles, that was in the Jewes, so as that the Infants of Beleevers should by vertue of naturall generation be reckoned as visible members, forasmuch as now the Church is not nationall as it was then, nor gathered as God did the Jewish Church by taking the whole nation for his people in one day, but now the Church of God is gathered by preaching up and down, some in one place and some in another in succession of time; That *1 Cor. 7. 14.* speaks not of federall holinesse, but matrimoniall; yea if the reason of the lawfulnessse of the living of two persons together in disparity of Religion, be taken from the vertue of faith in the one party, not from the relation of husband and wife, as Mr. *Marshalls* exposition makes it, the *medium* of the Apostle to prove the lawfulnessse of the living of a beleeving wife with an unbelieving husband, will as well prove the lawfulnessse of the living of a beleeving fornicatrix with an unbelieving fornicator; as may appeare by a syllogisticall analysis of the Apostles argument: the major whereof is this, according to Mr. *Marshalls* exposition. *That man and woman may lawfully dwell together, notwithstanding the unbeliefe of the one party whereof one is sanctified by the faith of the other for begetting of a holy seed;* this is manifestly the force of the Apostles reason after his exposition. Nor is it necessary to insert [*being husband and wife*] sith the sanctification is not ascribed by him to the relation of husband and wife, but to the faith of the one party, as the proper cause of it. And by Mr. *Blake Birth. priviledge, pag. 11. Holinesse in the text, is a fruit or result of faith in the parent.* Now the assumption; *the unbelieving fornicator is sanctified by the faith of the beleeving whore for the begetting a holy seed* Master *Marshall* denies not, but balkes only; telling me pag. 163. of his *Defence*, he could name Divines who are no whit inferiour to my selfe, who conceive that a beleever even then when he commits fornication with an infidel, doth so remove the barre in the unbelieving party, as that the child is (in the beleeving parents right) to be reckoned to belong to the Covenant of Grace, and the Church of God; which is in this sense to be sanctified, and it must needs be granted, for positive causa

ponitur



*ponitur effectus*, if the quality of faith be the cause of that sanctification, the sanctification followes in one, as well as the other. The conclusion then followes from Mr *Marshalls* exposition, *that the beleeving fornicatrix may still live after conversion, with her unbeleeving fornicator*; for they are still sanctified for the begetting of a holy seed; and the children so begotten are federally holy, it being Gods rule in this case: if Mr *Marshall* say true, *partus sequitur meliorem partem*. But this is so absurd a thing that I beleeve Mr *Marshall* himfelfe will when he understands it, quit his chiefe hold, and the judicious reader explode the exposition of 1 Cor. 7. 14. of federall holinesse.

And for the third conclusion of Mr *Marshall*, he hath not yet proved that the rite of Baptisme was appointed by Christ to succeed into the room, place, and use of circumcision; or that a command concerning circumcision, should be a command concerning baptisme: yea my exposition of Colof. 2. 11, 12. is acknowledged right by Mr *Marshall*, and consequently his inference overthrowne, as I said above. As for that which I alleaged that Baptisme was an old rite among the Jewes in initiating Profelytes, to shew that baptisme in exact speech doth not succeed circumcision, but is a continuation of an old rite to another purpose; as in exact speech the Lord doth not succeed the Passover, but is an old rite used at the Paschall supper among the Jewes, and continued by Christ to another purpose; Mr *Marshall* catcheth at as a proof for Infant-baptisme, because then the Profelytes children were baptized: pag. 256. But the answer to it is easie. For though the rite of Baptisme was an old use continued by *John Baptist* and Christ, yet I say it was to another purpose or use; as I shew, pag. 89. 90. of my *Examen*, clean of another nature; as Mr *Lightfoot Harmony*, part. 1. pag. 138. and was used according to another rule then among the Jewes. For they did not baptize Jewes either elder or younger as the same learned men I cited confesse, but onely the Gentiles because they were uncleane; and they were initiated by sacrifice as well as baptisme, with many other differences: but *John the Baptist* and Christs Disciples baptized Jewes as well as Gentiles, without sacrifice.

Baptisme and the rite of eating bread and drinking wine through old rites among the Jewes yet used to another end, and after another rule by Christians.

As for Mr *Marshalls* fourth conclusion, he confesseth pag. 128. *that the formall reason of the Jewes being circumcised was the command,*

The command  
confessed to be  
the formal rea-  
son of circum-  
cision by Mr  
Marshall.

*mand*, which if true; it is the distinguishing and constituting reason, *qua posita ponitur res, non posita non ponitur*; so that the Jewes ought to be circumcised because of the command, without a command what ever were their interest in the Covenant or Church-state, they were not to be circumcised. Now this is as much as need be to overthrow Mr *Marshall's* argument, which is to prove that infants are to be baptized precisely by vertue of interest in the Covenant without a command, because as hee supposeth the Jewes infants were circumcised meerly by vertue of the Covenant; for so the analogy or proportion in his reasoning must hold. The Jewes infants were in the Covenant, and therefore were to be circumcised; *Ergo*, it must be so with beleivers children now in Baptisme; where the formall reason is supposed to be the Covenant: but Mr *Marshall* both pag. 92. & pag 182. confesseth the formall reason is the command; and therefore though the Covenant be put, yet if the command were not put, circumcision of infants had been no duty, but a will-worship; and by parity of reason it is so in baptisme: infants are not to be baptized barely by vertue of Covenant-holinesse without a command; which is the main thing I contend for.

Circumcision  
a priviledge  
proper to the  
Jewish Church  
state.

As for the fifth conclusion of Mr *Marshall*, that which I answered continues still, that *circumcision though it were a priviledge to the Jewish Church, as the Arke, Tabernacle, high Priest, Temple were, belonging to that nationall Church-state, to have themselves and infants circumcised; yet it was a priviledge proper to that time not now to continue*: as the Apostle, Gal. 3. & 4. Heb. 9. & 10. shewes, it did not belong to the substance of the Covenant of grace common to Jewes and Gentiles; and so neither is it or any thing in the room of it any more a priviledge to us now then some house the room of the Temple: some chief Bishop in the room of the High Priest, &c. And therefore I say still, that this argument is indeed of no weight, but among vulgar and non-syllogizing capacities; and that Divines that use it do but flatter the people by it; and that if the reason be good, it overthrowes our compleatnesse in Christ, in whom we have Circumcision, Arke, Temple, Priest, all; and as I said in my *Exercitation* it is the very egge out of which most of the Popish ceremonies were hatched; to wit, because they thought wee must have priviledges as the Jewes,

and



and therefore must have something like that they had.

Mr Marshall, pag. 195. of his *Defence*, speaketh thus. First for the point of will-worship I shall desire you to prove this conclusion. That all things belonging to christian worship even in the circumstances of it, even the ages and sexes of the persons to whom the ordinances are to be applyed, must be expressly set downe in the new Testament; if you prove not this, you say nothing to the purpose, for this is our very case. To which I reply. That I owe not M. Marshall such service, as to prove what he shall like another *Eurystheus* injoyn me: I have pag. 111. pag. 152 of my *Examen* syllogistically set down my argument to prove Infant-baptisme will-worship, it belongs to him to tell me what he denies in my syllogisme, that I may prove it, though I have already done it, and shall doe more fully when he tells me what he doth deny: but it is a meer shift for him to impose on me the prooffe of a Proposition I owne not, and not tell me what he denies in my own syllogisme. This is contrary to the rules of disputation I have been acquainted with; yet if Mr Marshall shall declare that he holds the subject of baptism to be but a circumstance, I shall be ready to oppose him therein further; and shew that the point in difference is not the bare age or sexe, but qualification of persons to be baptized; yea the reason and main use of Baptisme.

As for Mr Marshall's principle for his virtuall command I have shewed above; that when he should have brought all Protestant Divines averring this maxime, that all the commands and institutions of God about the Sacraments of the Jewes; bind us as much as they did them in all things which belong to the substance of the Covenant, and were not accidentall to them: in stead of this he alleageth another thing, that Protestant Divines make the same generall nature, end and use of our Sacraments, and the Jewes Sacraments, and argue thereupon from one to the other, which is quite beside the business. For the maxime is of commands about the Sacraments, and they are all about the rituals of administrations, and concerning commands about the Sacraments, binding us as the Jewes, he produceth not one command binding us, or one Protestant avowing it.

No command about the Jewes Sacraments now in force.

As for the command, *Matth. 28. 19.* when I said, *μὴ δισκίωσιν* signifies to make Disciples, but no where are infants said to be disciplined,

Infants not  
Disciples, as  
Matth. 28. 19.  
is meant.

pled, Mr Marshall tells me that some learned criticks say that *μαθηται*, answers to an hebrew phrase among the Rabbins, of admission of schollers that they may be taught; which though I beleieve not, yet if it were granted serves not Mr Marshalls turn, unlesse he can shew that infants were said by them to be thus admitted schollars. Then Mr Marshall referres me with a blind direction to *Spanheimius*, whom I have consulted, and I find many absurdities in that learned Authours words *dub. Evang. part. 3. dub. 27*. This in effect he sayes that *μαθηται* contains not the act the Disciples were to doe, but the end of their sending, which I think is so absurd that it needs no other refutation then the mention, and then that they might *μαθηται* without teaching them; whereas he himselte sayes, *non significat solum docere sed & Discipulos facere*, so that according to him it includes teaching and somewhat more, and *equi-pollet* *et μαθηται ποιοι* *Io: 4. 1.* which was by teaching, and the parallell place, *Mark 16. 15.* is, *preach the Gospell to every creature.*

Baptizing  
households  
inferres not in-  
fant-baptisme.

I had said in my Examen, that the speech of baptizing Lydia's household, *Acts 16. 15.* must be understood by other places which when they expresse the baptizing of the household, they expresse also the beleiving or receiving of the word by the whole household, and by the frequent use of the word, which is to put the house for the people of growth in it. Mr Marshall saith, who taught you it must be so interpreted? I answer, *Augustin lib. 3. de doct. Christ. c. 26. ubi autem apertius ponuntur ibi discendum est quomodo in locis intelligentur obscuris; Chamier panstrat, Cathol. rom. 1. lib. 16. c. 6.* and all those Divines among which I think Mr Marshall is one, that say we must expound one text by comparing it with others that are like. To that I said, that [house] is frequently taken for the grown persons in it; Mr Marshall saith, it may very well be granted, and hurts not me, unlesse you can prove it must be so meant. Though I think I proved it must be so meant, yet it is enough to shew that Mr Marshall cannot prove from the baptizing of households an example of baptizing an infant, sith, the word house may be taken (as Mr. Marshall saith, may very well be granted) for the grown persons in that house.

As for Mr Marshalls second argument, because there was an equivocation in it, and in one sense the major must be denied, in another the minor; and if the major be understood in one sense, the

minor



minor in another; there bee foure termes, and the syllogisme is naught. To this Mr Marshall makes no reply in a logical form, but tells us in a loose discourse, *that forasmuch as there is no infallible ground of certainty, but onely of charity, that any growne person to be baptized hath actually the inward grace; and so in charity wee are to conceive of beleevers infants, because Christ said, Mark 10. 14. Of such is the kingdome of God, they are to be baptized* So that in his Defence Mr Marshall alters his argument which he set down in his Sermon, concluding not from a capacity of inward grace to Baptisme as he did then; but from the judgement of charity that they have actually the inward grace, which he seems to count sufficient for Baptisme. Mr Gerees reasoning is to the same effect: *vindic. paedobapt. ch. 1. sect. 7.* and is thus formed by him into a syllogism, *where we have evidence for judgement of charity, that there is the grace of the Covenant, there we may see the seal of the Covenant. But we have evidence for the judgement of charity, that in infants of beleevers there is the grace of the Covenant. Ergo, Of this Syllogism I deny both major & minor. Acts 10. 47. doth not prove the major. For the Apostle there did not baptize upon a judgement of charity of what was latent, but from a certaine sense of their magnifying God, and the gift of the holy Ghost; nor was Simon Magus baptized because in the judgement of charity hee had the grace of the Covenant, but because he professed the faith, which was certain to Philip. And this was Master Marshalls doctrine in his Sermon, pag. 47. where he confesseth that the Apostles charity or charitable conjecture was not the ground of their admitting them to the ordinance, but the profession and confession of the party made according to the word, which they were bound to rest in.* And therefore I see not how Mr Marshall can count a judgement of charity sufficient for Infant-baptisme, without crossing himselfe in his first Sermon. For my part I doe not think a Minister ought to be ruled in baptizing by his own judgement of charity (which is oftentimes very uncharitable to those that deserve best) but by certain knowledge of true sanctification by extraordinary revelation, or of the parties profession of the faith by other meanes, either of which is sufficient, not both necessary. Nor do I require of infants more assurance then of grown men, but shewes of repentance and faith in either. Yet, as when one being required

We have no evidence for judgement of charity concerning infants, nor is a judgement of charity to be our rule in administering Baptisme.

*An Apologie for the two Treatises*

to bring no more then a servants testimony for the grant of a thing, if he bring the masters hand and scale without the servants testimony and the thing be granted; he that grants it doth require no more then the servants testimony : so when I say, if shewes of repentance and faith be exhibited *I will baptize*, and *I will baptize* upon extraordinary revelation; that an infant is a beleever : *I* doe not require more assurance of an infant then of a growne person, when *I* say, if the infant professe the faith, *I will baptize*, if God witness for it that it is a beleever *I will baptize*, in neither goe *I* by judgement of charity, but certainty either of revelation or profession, which neither *Master Gere* nor *Master Marshall* can make good of all the infants of beleevers. But saith *Master Gere* *there's evidence in charity to judge that the children of beleevers have the grace of the Covenant*. To this *I* answer, the evidence for judgement of charity is to be taken from a persons own deeds according to the rule, *1 Cor. 13. 7. charity beleeueth all things, capacity of grace* is common to all persons on earth, and therefore is no ground to baptize one more then another. That *some infants have been actually partakers of inward grace*, as *Mat. 19. 14. Luke 1. 15. Jerem. 1. 5.* yeelds nothing to prove any judgement to be right that it is so in any other, but onely that it may be so. *Infants of beleevers are not under the Covenant of Grace or within the externall administration of it*, by vertue of *Gen. 17. 7. Deut. 30. 6.* they speak of more then externall administration, and must be understood of the elect which the Apostle denies to have bin ever by God assured to the natural seed, *Rom. 9. 8. 15.* no judgements of charity that the infants of beleevers are under the Covenant of Grace can be deducted from these texts, the most is conjecturall hope that it shall be so, which experience shewes to miscarry often, therefore these things yeeld not a warrant for infant-baptisme. Doctor *Homes* argues from *Matth. 19. 14.* that baptizing did in nature antecede imposition of hands, which is false; nor doth *Heb. 6. 2.* prove it. Nor is his argument good, *Infants had the greater Christs blessing, therefore they had or might have the lesse, to wit Baptisme*; which reason if good, it would follow they might have the Lords Supper, be ordained Ministers : for these are lesse then Christs blessing.

§ 19.  
Of Master  
Haffys his pre-  
tended satisfac-  
tory answer  
to my exerci-  
tation.

Afore the printing of this Apology, I met with and read a book  
of



of one Mr William Hussey a man unknown to me saving by a former treatise of his which I have seen, and he intitles it *satisfacti-  
on to Master Tombes his scepticall exercitation*: and in his Epistle to the Reader he saith, *and here I will turn sceptique with Master Tombes*. If I should give him the title of *fantasticke* in requitall of the title of *scepticke* he pins upon me, I could give better reason for it then he brings for his imposition of that new title on me: but it is enough for me to clear my self. *Gel. l. 11. c. 5. noct. Artic.* sayes, the Pyrrhonian Philosophers were called *Sceptickes*; that is, *seekers and considerers, because they determined nothing, but were alwayes in considering and seeking*; but Master Marshall thinks me guilty rather of too much selfe-confidence. Yea in this point though I did as I conceived befitting me then, propound my thoughts in the disputation with my brethren in the ministry, and in my *Exercitation* to the Committee of the Assembly under the term of doubts; yet in my *Examen* I assert them as positions, and therefore that authour doth unworthily intitle my *Exercitation* *scepticall*, or me a *scepticke*: which is in effect if he understood what he sayes, to accule me as adhering to nothing as certain in matters of sense, reason, or faith. But concerning the book though he intitle it *satisfaction*, and the licenser sayes [*finding it to be in his judgement solid and judicious*] and I am pretty well acquainted with the humour of men, who are ready to cry up any thing as satisfactory, which they affect; yet I beleive the Assembly will not conceive his book satisfactory, nor these passages following to be solid and judicious. As that in his Epistle to the Reader he calls *Baptisme the seale of the proffer of Grace*. pag. 3. I answer, that was an especiall privilege of the Jewes that they had their civill lawes from God, but what lieth upon a nation as a duty that it may require of all, and cutt off them that refuse; and this is implied in the Commission, when Nations shall covenant to be Disciples, which may be done by a part for the whole, then are such as are in commission from Christ commanded to baptize and teach the whole nation, such as are in authority may covenant in a nationall way for the inferiour sort, and justly require all externall performances from them, such as baptisme and submission to bee taught are, pag. 4. And what a parent can doe over his child in matter of duty, that may the parents of the country, the Magistrates require of

## An Apologie for the two Treatises

of the nations. God requireth it of them, they may put all nations to schoole to Christ. Now, what if some of them be too young to learne, yet if they be under the discipline of the Master they are Schollers? as may appeare in many litle children that are set to schoole to keepe them safe, and from wantonnesse, before they be of capacity to learne, many have a Hornbooke given, more for a play-game then a booke, yet are they Schollers, because under the discipline and correction of the Master; is it not therefore great reason, that a Christian should dedicate his child to Christ, to be partaker of the blessing and discipline of Christ? pag. 5. And certainly words could not have been invented that could have required the Ministers to baptize all the World, Infants and all, willing or unwilling; so that any would see they might be taught, and submit to the precepts and discipline of Christ, then to expresse it by the word nation and disciple. pag. 12. Abrahams seed must be divided into equivocall and univocall; equivocall seed Christ, for that he was not like Abraham, he was of Abraham, but ex parte according to the flesh. Rom. 1. 3. He was the promised seed, not the seed unto whom the promise did belong, as the seed of Abraham. pag. 43. That which we argue from receiving of families, and from the Apostles commission to baptize nations is, that nations may make Lawes for their whole nations to be baptized; and if the major part of a nation do according to their duty receive baptisme, and undertake for the whole nation to submit themselves to become Schollers of Christ, they may justly compell by any penalty to joyne with them in the externall worship of God. This therefore is it which is drawn from the commission directed to the Disciples for the baptizing of nations, that nations may act as nations, and families as families; that is, that the more organicall parts must act for the residue. the magistrates for the nation, the master of the family for the residue. the magistrates for the nation, the master of the family for the family; otherwise it cannot be said to be the act of the nation, or of the family, though a post factum may be historically related to overspread a nation that is done without a nationall consent, to shew the universality of a spreading evill: yet, where a duty is charged upon a nation, it cannot be orderly received without a nationall consent. pag. 44. He that keepeth any servant that will not be baptized, is not a good Christian: it is true, all men of discretion ought to con-

sent



sent to every duty; baptisme is a duty without consent, as all other precepts are, it is pactum impositum. pag. 46. The parties to be baptized are all nations, without any restriction at all. 47. If they that claime their interest in baptisme can undertake for whole nations, the commissioners must not refuse them: the nation beleeveth by the magistrate, by whose authority the whole nation is put to schools to Christ, pag. 54. Aden may require of him that is of years to consent to his baptisme, laying the neglect on him as a sinne, and punishing him for it as for adultery, fornication or any other publique offence. pag. 59. If any will bring Turke children, and Infidels to baptisme, and assume the instruction of them in the doctrine of the Gospel, I know not but they may: and if Parker would part with their children to Christians, I thinke it were a very charitable thing so to do: For the promise was never so tied to Abrahams loyns, neither for ought I know, to any beleevers, but to education in the family of Abraham, or any other beleeving family. pag. 61. They that beleve, and they that beleve not heare the word, and it is no prophaneation of the word to Preach it to an Infidel, neither is it any prophaneation of baptisme, to baptize an Infidel. pag. 64. And indeed, it were a very strange thing for the Sacrament of baptisme to be tendered to men that were already clean, and approved, declared and manifested to be cleane; it is true, it may be tendered to men that profess their faith, because man cannot judge them faithfully, notwithstanding any profession, and therefore baptize them; but if they could know and judge them faithfully, they might give them the Lords Supper, in which all Christ is communicated, and baptisme should not be needfull, baptisme is the seale of the tender of Christ, and of the purging power of his blood, not of our Communion, or partaking of Christ; that is sealed in the other Sacrament. pag. 64. It is true, adults must have faith, such as it is, naturall, humane: before he can be baptized, he must be willing by some inclination or other: it were barbarous to baptize a grown man against his will, which could not be gotten but by some kind of credence, though it might be just with man to punish him with death that should refuse, as it is with God, to punish with eternall death such as despise baptisme. Nor do I thinke the principal ground of his new conceit pag. 3. will satisfie, which is, that Matt. 28. 19. is thus to be expounded, make all Nations Disciples by baptizing them, and teaching:

reaching: whereas he himselfe sundry times reads it better, *make Disciples of all nations baptizing them*, and it is vainely alleaged that [by] is implied in the participiall expression, any more then verse 9. *αὐτοὶ αὐτῷ ἠκολούθησαν* must be expounded hee met them by saying, or *Matth. 27, 55.* *ἠκολούθησαν δὲ αὐτῷ* they followed by ministring unto him; and I said justly, *Examen* pag. 127. *this conceit is so absurd, that I presume none that hath any wit will entertain it*, though *Master Hussy* say page 6 *I thinke if ever a man were out of his wit, it was here*: but I shall be willing the Assembly judge whether of us two need sayle to *Anticyra* to purge our braines. As for his answer to my book though I conceive it lettice fit for some lips, yet in my apprehension it containes a fardell of mistakes, in Logick, Divinity; and sometimes in Grammar, but most of all of my meaning, and the scope of my words, and force of my reasons, which being diligently compared with his book, are a sufficient reply to it. And therefore though hee conclude with a challenge to me, yet he must pardon me if I make more account of my time then to cast it away in refuting such wild notions as he hath vented, except I shall have so much spare time as to write a booke to make sport with; wishing nevertheless that *Master Hussy* had some schoole of Divinity as he desires, that he might be either better fitted to write, or learn to be silent.

## §. 20.

The Epilogue of this Apology concerning the reason of the enlargement of it, the Authors present estate and future intentions.

I have been larger in this matter then I intended at this time, that I might shew the vanity of Mr *Leyes* vaunt, and however God dispose of me, doe my indeavour to cleare the truth in this thing, and to prevent perlecution of it through the provocation and exasperation of spirit towards Anti-pædobaptists, which since these writings have been published, hath many wayes discovered it selfe. If the Lord spare me life, liberty, and meanes, and it bee found necessary; I may either more briefly or more largely rescue my treatises from their hands, who have ill handled them and perverted the truth. In the mean time this which is already said might serve a judicious Reader to answer the writing of my Antagonists though no more should follow. Mr *Mar.* book it appears from pag. 59. 212. 227. was contrived by divers: I beleve the ablest of the Assembly, I wish it were declared whether the Pædobaptists would stick to that work or any other, I heare there are more yet to be printed, if the aime be to oppresse me with number,



or to have this evasion; that when one is answered, yet some other is not answered; and so to uphold the error still (which is a way of Jesuites) I doubt not but God will defend his truth. What hitherto is objected against my two Treatises and Appendix, I doubt not but with Gods assistance to answer. Afore I could finish this Apology, I have tasted the fruits of Mr Marshalls, and Mr Geres accusation in a message from the Benchers of both houses of the Temple; that though they acknowledge my life and labours among them unprovable, yet by reason of the publishing of my treatises they cannot continue me here. It was foretold me, that some of the assembly would not give over till they had outed me hence. If any of them have dissuaded the people from hearing me, though they cannot shew that I have preached any other thing then Gospell truth; if they use any arts to withdraw the people from me, I wish them to consider how they can acquit such actions from the sin of making schisme, and stopping the course of the Gospell for their own ends, not permitting any to preach the Gospell without concurrence in opinion with them, when as Paul rejoiced that Christ was preached; though it added affliction to his bonds, Phil. 1. 18. what my desire was in the Prologue of my Examen, is still, that we may give one another the right hand of fellowship, and stand fast in one mind in the truth of the Gospell, and cleare the truth of God to the people whose eyes are upon us. I may call God to witnesse that my ayme in making and publishing my Treatises, was the benefit of the Assembly by making knowne to them reasons why the Doctrine of the Directory should be better examined, which would be their honour: if they disclaim me, reject me, repay evill for good, I hope God will help me to bear it, and to love them still, and joyn with them in promoting the work of Christ; notwithstanding I meet with discouragements where I assured my selfe greatest encouragement.

To conclude; as the case now stands, I know not into what corner of the Land or world God may carry me, nor how I may be accommodated to publish any thing more either in this of Infant-baptisme, or any other point of sacred knowledge; it is not a little comfort to me that I have framed this Apology, it shal be my witnesse in time to come that I have sought unity with truth; and as I have made it my busines to preserve purity of doctrine, so I shal still

though I have neither found recompence nor help considerable from men, but rather am likely to meet with a consumption of estate, & a shortning of my dayes. However things succeed, I shall request that they that can pray, would beg for me that I may doe nothing against the truth, but for the truth; and for the Churches of Christ, that the Pastors and teachers in them may take heed of bending their wits to maintaine what the prime reformers, and Churches ordered by them have avouched, rather then impartially and throughly to examine their doctrine, which as it is a great sin of making other masters then Christ, so it is a cause of most mischievous rents and contentions.

~~some of the assembly would not give over their wits and hearts to  
hence. It say of them have disswayed the people from hearing  
me, though they cannot shew that I have preached any other  
thing then the Gospell, which they say are so widely as the  
pictures are, I will shew to consider how they can receive such  
affairs from the Gospell, and keeping the count  
of the Gospell for their own ends, not permitting any to preach  
the Gospell without concurrence in opinion with them, when as  
I have rejoiced that Christ was preached; though it added little  
on to his words. Psal. 118. What my desire was in the Psalme  
of my Ex. 118. is still, that I might have another the right hand  
of fellowship, and stand fast in one mind in the truth of the Gospell,  
and cleave the truth of God to the people whose eyes are upon us. I  
may call God to witness that my aime in making and publishing  
my Treatises, was the benefit of the Assembly by making knowne  
to them, why the Gospell should be  
ter examined, which would be their honour: if they disclaim me,  
reject me, repay evil for good, I hope God will help me to bear  
it, and to love them still, and joy with them in promoting the  
work of Christ; notwithstanding I meet with discouragements  
where I shew my selfe greatest encouragement.~~

To conclude; as the case now stands, I know not into what  
end of the world God may carry me, nor how I may be  
accommodated to know any thing more either in this of Antis-  
papisme or any other point of sacred knowledge; it is not a little  
concomit to me that I have trained this Assembly, I shalbe my wit-  
nesse in time to come that I have fought many with truth; and as I  
have made it my business to preserve purity of doctrine, so I shal still  
though





## A Postscript, wherein is a reply to Mr. Blakes answer to my letter.

Reader.

**B**E pleased to take notice, that whereas I say p. 21. of this *Apology*. *Molin* in his *Epistle* to *Bishop Andrews* (if my memory deceive me not) confessed it to have been *ab ipsius Apostolorum temporibus*, meeting since the printing of that passage, with the booke I find that in that *Epistle* he only confessed it to have been *a seculo Apostolis proximo*, but *Bishop Andrews* saith, he had put out that which ellwhere he said *ab Apostolorum seculo*. Whence my mistake of memory conceiving he had said it there, which he said ellwhere, but altered it in that *Epistle*. 2. That though I had seen most of the latter part of Mr. *Blakes answer* to my letter some dayes before, yet I had not the whole booke till Aug. 3. 1646. at which time the tenth sheet of this *Apology* was printing off; and therefore I cannot give thee so large advertisements on it, as I desired to doe; yet I have thought it convenient to say thus much in this streight of time, as not knowing how I may be hereafter fitted to write any more.

The Booke is ushered with a preface of Mr. *Calamy*, and Mr. *Vines*, in which they say: *The right of Infants to Baptisme is carried strongly by Scripture arguments, if legitima consequence can make an apodicticall evidence.* To which I say, that Master *Mary*'s first argument is accounted the strongest, and that is far from being apodicticall, as hath been shewed above.

They say *The practise of the Church in all ages in baptizing* *abim* is carried by such undoubted testimonies of credible witness-

§ 1. The occasion of this postscript.

§ 2. Of Mr. *Calamy* and Mr. *Vines* their wrong judgement of the dispute, Mr. *Blakes* book, and my discussing the point.

*An Apologie for the two Treatises*

ses, that he that doth not see it may well be called Strabo, that is, goggle eyed.

How true this is the Reader may perceive by the *Examen* of Master *Marshalls* Sermon, and this *Apology*. The best or rather only witnesse of ancients for such a practise is *Augustin*, concerning whom how little reason there is to count his speech undeniable hath been before declared here, and in the *Examen*.

They say of the *Birth-priviledge* of Master *Blake*: where thou shalt find the question so truly stated, and set upon the right Basis, and so well fortified, that though there hath been a dust raised (by some who have a better faculty to raffle and intricate an argument than to wind it off) yet there is not the least wing of it routed. To this I say, the state of the question hath small difficulty, little or no disagreement between me and Master *Marshall*, and Master *Geree*, and I thinke the like of others. If by the *Basis* is meant Master *Blakes* observation pag. 3. of the *Birth-priviledge*, *A people that enjoy Gods ordinances convey to their issue a priviledge to be reputed of a society that is holy, to be numbred amongst not uncleane, but holy.* This observation is ambiguous, it may be true in a sence, that it so happens frequently; but if it be meant in this sence, that they convey by their generation of them a right of visible Church-membership, and title to the initiall seale, as it is usually called it is not true: which onely serves for the purpose. Now the wings by which that observation is fortified out of the new Testament, (wherein the strength lyes) are *Acts* 2. 38. 39. *Rom.* 11. 16, 17. *1 Pet.* 2. 9. *Gal.* 4. 29. *Gal.* 2. 15. *1 Cor.* 7. 14. now for three of these to wit *1 Pet.* 2. 9. *Gal.* 4. 29. *Gal.* 2. 15. they flye of themselves, the first expressly being spoken of them onely that beleeve, v. 7. the second to wit, being borne after the flesh, cannot be understood as importing a priviledge or benefit, it being spoken of persons to the worser sence, and causing a casting out of the inheritance: the third is meant not of a Jew allusively so called, but of a Jew by naturall generation, opposed to a Gentile, and so cannot be said of the children of believing Gentiles; nor can all Master *Blakes* words keep them from running out of the field. The text *Acts* 2. 39. if it be understood (as it must) of the promise of saving graces by Christ cannot be verified of any but those that are called, which it being confessed to limit the first branch



branch of the Proposition, and the last, *you, and as many as are asfarre off*; it is to mee against reason and truth that it should be left out in the middle, that is, that when it is said *the promise is to you, and to all that are asfarre off being called*, it should be asserted in that branch that is between, *the promise is to your children whether called or not*. Of Rom. 11. 16, 17. I have said sufficiently before. Of 1 Cor. 7. 14. somewhat also before: and intend more in this postscript. If Mr Calamy and Mr Vines accuse me of *raising a dust*, and *rassling and intricating an argument* (which I imagine they doe becaule *the raising of a dust* is Master Marshall's phrase) they are answered in this *Apology*. My entring into the lists with Mr Marshall was not out of choice *as valuing my self*, as they mistake; but out of necessity lead thereto by providence of God. How well I have acquitted my selfe may appeare by the bringing of Master Marshall to many concessions which overthrow his first argument. Whether this answer of Master Blake be *finewy for argument*, I hope in time to examine. I conceive that to put the question upon the right *Basis*, is to examine whether the formall reason why the Jewes were circumcised, were their interest in the Covenant? whether there be the same Church-state now that was then? whether any command about the Jewes Sacraments now bind us? But I passe to Mr Blakes answer.

Mr Blake chargeth me with defect and neglect of charity. For the former I doe not take my writing to discover it, what I shall deprehend I have failed in, I shall I hope confesse to God, and to Master Blake when we meet. My not speaking to Master Blake was, because I presumed Master Marshall had acquainted him with the thing, and the reason of printing my Treatises as they were is declared above. Why I would not take upon me the place of opponent in the dispute with my brethren I gave the reason, because the argument would presently lead them to oppose; this being al my argument against Infant-baptism that I could well urge in dispute, that it is not appointed by God, and so presently upon one or two syllogismes they must become opponents again, *sic affirmanti incumbit probatio*; I sent not my *Exercitation* to my opponents because I was advised to send to the Committee, named in the *Prologue* of my *Examen*; the rest is answered in the *Apology*.

To

*An Apologie for the two Treatises*

To the point of antiquity in *Ch. 2.* I thinke not needfull to adde any more here. To the third chapter *sect. 1.* Master *Blake* because I said *Examen pag. 144.* those I mention, that you may see what stuffe *Pedobaptists* do feed the people with, doth thus against reason, and charity inferre, that I branded therein all the *Ministers of Christ* that ever held *Infant-baptisme*, whereas my speech being indefinite should in such a contingent matter have been interpreted only as equipollent to a particular proposition, & the words were used onely of that *Author*, and such as delivered like doctrine, with particular exception of Master *Marshall*, and many others there named. Passion I confesse was in me sometimes in writing my *examen*, a mixt passion of griefe, and indignation, that Preachers of the Gospell should be so hard, as then I found, and saw likely would be more; to their dissenting brethren upon such weake reasons. But such contumelious confutes and practises as Master *Blakes* sinister conceits put upon me I deny.

§.4. They that deny Infant-baptisme need not teach that Infants perish.

To the second section I answer, that I still conceive, they that deny *Infant-baptisme*, and grant originall sinne, are not necessitated to say that Infants perish in their birth. It is true as Master *Blake* sayes, they that will hold a certainty of the salvation of such Infants, they must maintain a promise or covenant to them; but such a covenant I deny to be made as assures salvation to the Infants of beleivers: and I have proved at large, *Examen part. 3. §. 4.* there is not such a Covenant. If that *Gen. 17. 7.* be produced, I have proved that it was particularly spoken of *Abrahams* seed, expounded *Rom. 9. 8.* not to be meant of his naturall seed, but spirituall, and therefore till it be proved that all Infants of beleivers dying in Infancy, are *Abrahams* spirituall seed; that promise will not inferre the certainty of their salvation. Therefore, this is my judgement: that God will have us to suspend our judgement of this matter, & to rest on the Apostles determination, *Rom. 9. 18.* But they that hold that there is no certainty of their salvation, are not necessitated to hold a certainty of their perdition, for there is a medium between both, a hope though not certain, yet probable, and comfortable, that the children of beleivers dying in their Infancy are saved; taken from some generall indefinite promises: the favour of God to the parents, and the experience that in all ages



ages hath been had of his mercifull dealing with the children of his servants; all which cannot be said of the Infants of Infidels, though on the other side we must not so exclude the Infants of Infidels, as to affirme that none of them are saved. For though the Gentiles were *without hope*, Ephes. 2. 12. in respect of the body of them, yet now and then God called some, as *Rahab* out of the visible Church, and therefore we may not determine universally that out of the visible Church there is no salvation at all: but leave this to Gods free-will. It doth not hence follow, *that heathens have equal hopes of salvation with Infants of Christians*. For though they have not hopes from their innocency in themselves, or certaine interest in Christ; yet they have more probable hopes of interest in Christ upon the grounds forenamed. And thus is that section answered.

The fourth chapter is about my censure of his argument from Gal. 4. 29. as containing very grosse passages. He accuſeth me as one that intended not any ingenuum dealing, because I bring but one branch of the *medium* in his argument, and yet call it his *medium*. But sith I intended not a full answer to him, but to Master Marshall it was enough that I only recited that in which was indeed the strength of his argument, which was that *birth after the flesh* ascribed to some nam. Gal. 4. 29. imports a privilege, title, or Church interest to some in the bosome of the Church of Christians. In saying this was very grosse, I sayed no more then that which was right: the Apostle opposing persons borne after the flesh, to them that are borne after the spirit, to be cast out, and not to inherit. But sayes Master Blake, *you shut out the literall sense of birth after the flesh, both from the history, and parallel, and bring an allegoricall sense in both, when the contrary in the text is evident*. I answer, I shut not out the literall sense from the history, but from the parallel; and that is so farre from being contrary to the text, that it is expressly said, these things are *in you as an allegory*. But he further objects: *you make birth after the flesh, and birth of the spirit, two contradistinct species of births, that both cannot be incident to one man, whereas it is the distribution of a subject according to its severall adjuncts*. I answer, I make them not onely contradistinct, but also contrary; and I deny that it is a distribution of a subject according to its severall adjuncts. For then the

§ 5.  
Of my censure of Master Blakes producing Gal. 4. 29 for the birth priviledge.

the same person should be both borne after the flesh and after the spirit. which I would tell Master *Blake* to be very absurd, but that I would give him no more occasion to say I do *insult, whoop, and jeere*, which he unjustly chargeth on me. And for that he saith, that *Isaack was borne after the flesh*, (though it be true, he was so in the two senses Master *Blake* mentions which are nothing to this place of the Apostle) it is untrue in the Apostles sense, for then he should be the child of the bondmayd; not by promise, a persecutor to be cast out not to inherit, and a type of legall justiciaries belonging to the covenant in mount *Sinai*, for all these things are true of him that is borne after the flesh, *Gal. 4. 22, &c.* But the Apostle doth not say, that they are cast out, but mentions a command of casting them out. As if Gods *diktum* were not *factum*: if they were not cast out, why doth the Apostle alleage that text? But they are in the Church, otherwise they could not be cast out. I answer, I deny not but legall institutiaries may be in the visible Church, as *Ismael* in *Abrahams* house; though the Apostle make the parallel only in the casting out that they might not inherit, but if Master *Blake* would gather any thing hence for his purpose, he must prove that the Apostle makes some to be in the visible Church, by vertue of being borne after the flesh as their prerogative, which is as wide from the Apostles meaning, as East & West. But saith Master *Blake* where I pray you, do I make such *Abrahams* seed? it is no grosse error of mine, but a grosse device or calumny of yours. I answer, his words [if there yet remaine in the bosome of the Church children borne after the flesh, so that distinction of births (as applied to *Abrahams* seed) still hath place amongst beleeving Christians] shew that he applied birth of the flesh to *Abrahams* seed, else why are those words put in [as applied to *Abrahams* seed] but to shew a double seed of *Abraham*, one borne after the flesh, which is all one with the Apostle as legall institutiaries, another borne after the spirit, which is all one as beleivers: so that this is Master *Blakes* tergiversation, not my calumny.

§. 6.  
Of the necessity of my taking paines in my *Examen* to find out the meaning of Mr. *Marshalls* second conclusion by reason of the ambiguity of his expressions.

In The fifth chapter Mr. *Blake* complains, that I take more paines then needs to find out Master *Marshalls* meaning in his second conclusion, and after. And indeed I never saw a learned man so run himselfe into a maze needlessly, as you in this discourse do; being at a stand,



stand; you say, whether Master Marshall meanes a covenant of grace, or outward ordinances, as though these two were opposite, and priviledge of ordinances were not of grace, or that saving grace could be had, in Gods ordinary way, without this priviledge. To acquit my selfe of this imputation, I say, that it was very necessary to take that paines I did, to bring my selfe out of that maze which I had not run my selfe into; but the confusednesse and ambiguity of Master Marshalls expressions lead me into. Master Marshall had made this the antecedent in his first argument, *The Infants of beleeving parents are faderati, or within the covenant of grace*; This I conceived to be the same with his second conclusion, though against the rule of dispute he varies the terme [*faderati, or within the covenant of grace*] into this, [*he would have to be accounted his, to belong to him, to his Church and family, and not to the Devils*] which I do not take to be equipollent. This necessitated me to shew the many senses of his words, and to take paines to find out his meaning; else I knew not what to deny, or what to grant. Now, to clear the matter: when it is said, *Infants of beleevers are faderati, or in the covenant of grace*, this may be understood three wayes. 1 *They are in the covenant of grace* by their owne act of covenanting, because they promise the performance of the condition on their part, and this sense is manifestly false; and yet when Master Marshall sayes *they are to be accounted covenanters*, he speakes as if he meant so: For what is a covenanter but he that makes a promise? 2 *They are in the covenant of grace* by the administratours act, because he gives them the seale of the covenant; but then the second conclusion should be, *they are baptized or to be baptized*, now this being the same with the antecedent of Master Marshalls first argument, his argument must be thus; *Infants of beleevers are baptized, or to be baptized, ergo they are to be baptized*, which is meerly to trifle: and yet as I shewed above, this is the effect of Master Marshalls arguing, who will have his second conclusion, and antecedent understood of *the outward covenant*, as he calls it. 3 *They are in the covenant of grace* by Gods act of promise, and this is that which Master Marshall should have said, if he would have spoken plainly without equivocation, God by his promise to the *Infants of beleevers* puts them in the covenant of grace, or he accounts them

in the covenant of grace, because he hath promised grace to them, and not have said God would have them accounted his by us, by giving them the outward covenant, as he calls it. Now, if he affirme this, that God hath promised grace to Infants of beleevers, this grace is either saving grace, or outward ordinances. But saith Master *Blake* these are not opposite, but subordinate. Be it so, yet they are distinct, and the promise of the one is not a promise of the other: the promise of the Word and Sacraments, is not a promise of the Spirit. Now here was the doubt, whether Master *Marshall* affirme a promise of saving grace to beleevers Infants, or of outward ordinances. I said neither was true, yet the former was more agreeable to his meaning. To prove this I alleaged, that though sometimes Master *Marshall*, Master *Blake* and others spake more warily, (in which I dealt candidly with Master *Blake*, reciting his expresse words full enough for the purpose,) yet I said most of Mr. *Marshalls* and others expressions, and one expression of Master *Blake* spake as if they meant that God had made a covenant, or promise of saving grace. And to prove it to be their meaning: produced their allegation of these textes, *Acts* 2.39. *Gen.* 17.7. *Matt.* 19.14. which are to be understood of saving grace, and that otherwise the seale would be put to a blanke, and that Master *Blake* saith, *God promisetb to be a God in covenant to his and their seed, which people in covenant have also a promise from him of the Spirit.* Now what layes Master *Blake* to this, he denyes not that these texts speake of a promise of saving grace, but askes me how they are meant, whether absolutely or immediately? and then fastens upon me an assertion that is none of mine, and I beleeve wrongs Master *Blackwood* too. But herein Master *Blake* goes from the businesse, and instead of a respondent becomes a poser. I proved these texts alleaged by them for Infants being in the covenant of grace speake of a promise of saving grace, and therefore if Master *Marshall* meane not that the covenant of saving grace is made to a beleevers child, these texts are alleaged to no purpose by him. This is no place to answer Mr. *Blakes* unpertinent questions; which he propounds to me as supposing that because I said, the texts are plainly meant of saving graces, therefore I had affirmed the Jewes and all their seed had an absolute promise of a saving grace: let Master *Blake* tell us whether



whether in alleaging *Gen. 17. 7. Acts 2. 39.* for infants of beleevers being in the Covenant, he understand not those texts of a promise of saving grace, which is all I there contend for. As for *Mat. 19. 14.* it is plainly meant of the kingdome of glory; *Luk. 18. 15. 17 Mark. 10. 14, 15.* And for the speech of *sealing to a blanke, &c.* Whether it be true or false it was not materiall to my purpose; but whether it shew that the users of it assert a promise of saving grace to beleevers. Mr *Blake* upon a mistake, that I had set down sundry things as my assertions chargeth me as using *Bellarmines argument*, and sets down his own answer out of *Amesius*, besides the busines who onely alleaged other mens speeches to shew their meaning. As for his own speech he endeavours to make it good, which for present was not excepted against, but onely alleaged to shew that even Mr *Blake* asserts a promise of saving grace to infants of beleevers, for a promise of the Spirit is such. But saith Mr *Blake*, *Some promises doe suppose a condition: such is the promise of the Spirit as there I understand it, and you may see in Christs words John 7. 39. in the Apostles words; Ephes. 1. 13.* To which I say that it is true of the speciall gifts of the Spirit, or the increase, or comforts, or assurance of the Spirit; as *John 7. 39. Ephes. 1. 13.* they suppose a condition, but if hee meane it of the regenerating work of the Spirit, (as the words lead me to conceive he meant) then the promise of the Spirit hath no condition, as Doctor *Twisse* proves in many places particularly. *The Synod of Dort and Art's, &c. part. 3. Sect. 6.* and it is cleare, for if God have promised regenerating grace upon condition, that condition must be performed either by himselfe or by the person to whom it is promised; if the condition be to be performed by himselfe, it is all one with an absolute promise; if by the person to whom it is promised, then something may be done by a man that may procure Gods grace, and so *gratia Dei datur secundum meritum nostrum*, which is *Palagianisme*. Now they that say the Covenant of grace in respect of saving graces is made to a beleevers seed; must either exclude the first promise in the Covenant of grace, *Heb. 8. 10* of writing Gods lawes in their hearts, without which he is not their God; or else hold that promise absolute, & so all infants of beleevers must be regenerate & saved. Yet that this is the common doctrine, that beleevers children have a promise of saving graces, is manifest

*An Apologie for the two Treatises*

fest in that from hence they assert the certainty of their salvation if they dye in infancy, not considering that if God have made such a promise to a beleevers seed, it will as well assure the salvation of a beleevers seed in old age as infancy; sith in old age they are their seed, and the promise in respect of regenerating grace, which brings with it all the rest, must needs be absolute. And therefore the promises *Deut. 30. 6. Isas. 54. 13.* and such like must be restrained to the elect as our Saviour doth; *John 6. 45. & Gen. 17. 17.* is expounded by *Paul, Rom. 9. 8.* I had said Mr *Marshalls* words must be understood as the words of the Directory, the promise is made to beleevers and their seed; which is to be meant of the promise of saving grace. Mr *Blake* conceives the meaning to be of the promises mentioned, that they are the grace promised; but I perceive he did not or would not understand my words: I did not speak of the word [*promises*] in the direction for petition, that Mr *Marshalls* conclusion must interpreted by it; but of the word [*promise*] in that assertion in the doctrinall part [*the promise is made to beleevers and their seed*] which cannot be interpreted of the thing promised; but Gods act of promise, which is said to be made, to wit by him: afore the promised is obtained. So that this new devise will not serve the words of the Directory.

I had said. *And that in that Covenant (Gen. 17. 7.) should be a promise to us beleeving Gentiles (which words Mr Blake leaves out in the repetition) that to our seed should be conferred visible Church-priviledges, &c. is but a dream, &c.* to this saith M. B. *This objection riseth up against God himselfe, rather then any one of your adversaries.* But how this should rise up against God, Mr *Blake* neither doth nor can shew: Mr *Blake* seems to runne to his old shift, that God promisseth Church-priviledges upon condition. If so, *Cedo conditionem.* Let Mr *Blake* set down that condition, and I doubt not but either to force him to confesse that the reason of the preaching the Gospell to some & their being visible members, is something in man which will be *Pelagianisme*, or else Gods promise is absolute; and so God not keeping it, shall be guilty of Faith-breaking. Master *Marshall*, pag. 127. of his *Defence* acculeth me that I sometimes say that *Gen. 17. 7.* was a promise peculiar to Abraham, at other times it was at the utmost to be extended no further then to Abraham Isaac and Jacob, to have their posterity (as born of them)



so belong to the visible Church. But Master Marshall wrongs me, I have neither of these Propositions in either of my Treatises; what I conceive of it I have set down plainly, *Exercit. pag. 2. 3.* But Master Marshall would have the promise, *I will be the God of thy seed as promising visible Church-membership to belong to the naturall seed of every beleever. 1. because the Covenant was made to him for his Faiths sake. Ans.* if that were the motive, yet it followes not the promise belongs to every beleever as Abraham; no more then it followes, the promise, *Matth. 16. 18, 19.* was made to Peter by reason of his confession, *verse 16.* therefore it was made to every one that confesseth as Peter did, 2. How else should Profelytes children have Church-membership. *Ans.* Not by vertue of that promise, but by vertue of Gods command. *Exod. 12. 48* To his third reason I have often answered and proved, that *Deut. 30. 6. Isai 44. 2, 3. Isai 59. 21.* must be meant of the elect, else how did God keep that promise when he did not circumcise the heart of Davids and Josiahs children. Master Marshall pag. 129. puts this upon me; that I say God made this promise to Abraham Isaac and Jacob, to be the God of them, and their seed. But I doe not remember that I say so any where, nor that the Scriptures sayes so though I meet with promises somewhat like it, *Gen. 26. 24 Gen. 28. 4. 14.* But these promises so farre as they pertain to their naturall seed, were peculiar to them; and pertain not to every beleever, and his naturall seed. For none of the Gentiles are Abrahams seed, but by Faith. From all which I conclude, there is not a promise either of saving grace or Church-priviledge made to the seed of beleevers, and so they are not certainly in the Covenant of grace; in respect of Gods act of promising.

Master Blake sayes, *What will you say of those that remembred that God was their rock, and the high God their redeemer; yet were not stedfast in his Covenant: Psalm. 78. 35. 37. These were a people within Covenant. I say this to it, that by his covenant is not meant Gods Covenant or promise to them, but their Covenant to God; or rather Gods commands called metonymically his Covenant.*

Master Blake saith, *And where I pray you doe you find those words that christianity is hereditary? Those are no words of mine but a supplement of yours. I answer, these words are Master Blakes*

Blakes Birth-priviledge, pag. 6. The priviledges which in family or nation are hereditary are conveyed from parents to posterity; the child of a noble man is noble, so the child of a christian is a christian, and this is all one as to say christianity is hereditary.

I passe by the vindicating of two speeches of mine in this chapter, because I must hasten.

To the sixth chapter I have spoken so much as is needfull before.

S. 7.  
Of the Corin-  
thians doubt.  
1 Cor. 7. 12, 13  
14.

In the seventh Master Blake accuseth me for abusing Master Thomas Goodwin, but there is no abuse all; for my words onely make use of Master Goodwins expression, which Master Blake denies not to have been his, but that he altered it, which may be unwitting to me. But for the thing I still say that the Corinthians doubt was not about their children. For that which is the doubt is to be the conclusion of his argument that resolves it, but that which the Apostle speaks of the Corinthians children, it is plain by the argumentative particles [*immo alio modo*] is a medium of a syllogism, as Mr. Blake page 27 denies not; *nunc omnia probata esse per notiora*, therefore it was not the thing in doubt. Besides ver. 15, 16. following, pertain to the resolution of the doubt ver. 12, 13. which shewes that they are all a continued resolution of the same doubt, without any such unmethodicall interposition of the resolution of another doubt; as Mr. Blake imagines.

As for the occasion of the scruple, sith neither of our opinions is any other then a conjecture, I let it passe. One passage of Mr. Blakes in these words. And I pray you speake whether you doe believe, that the Corinthians took it for a common received principle; that if a man had an adulterous wife, that his children were legitimate, and not bastards; so it must be, if your opinion passe for a reason. I know not how he collects from my words; I say, that the Corinthians took it for certain that their owne children were holy, that is legitimate; and I say the force of the Apostles argument lies in this Proposition, that all the children of those parents, whereof one is not sanctified to the other, that is, doe not lawfully couple together are unclean, that is illegitimate; and that the Apostle saith, the unbelieving husband is sanctified to the wife, that is, is lawfully used by his wife because hee is her husband, as if he had been holy; out of which, all the engines of Mr. Blakes will cannot extort the inference he puts on my opinion.



In the second section *Mr Blake* sayes, that I heard before *Mr Goodwins* Lectures of instrumentall sanctification. If it were so, yet I professe I did never hee or know it so as to take notice of it till I heard *Mr Thomas Goodwin* use the phrase. *Mr Blake* to my first argument against instrumentall sanctification, saith; And is not this argument of yours of as great force against your interpretation of a matrimoniall, as ours of an instrumentall sanctification? I answer no: for they that cannot beget children may be said to be sanctified matrimonially, that is, may lawfully come together; but not instrumentally so as to beget a holy seed, which is *Master Blakes* sense. For they that by age or accidentall inabilities cannot be sanctified for generation, cannot beget children either by Covenant or legitimate. *Mr Blake* addes. The sanctifying by the believing party here mentioned, respects the issue which you confesse in grounding a legitimation of issue upon it. I grant where there is issue, the holiness of it depends on the sanctification; but where there is sanctification, it is not alwayes supposed there is issue, or that there may be issue: to the begetting of which, they are instrumentally sanctified. *Mr Blake*. This sanctifying (whether instrumentall or matrimoniall) hath its influence upon the seed; such a brand lying upon all the issue, where there is issue (be it bastardy or gentilisme) were enough to conclude against such marriages, one principal end of marriage being posterity. He supposeth it seems, that uncleanenes is here meant, which is such a brand on the issue as is enough to conclude against all such marriages. This is very right, but I subsume that brand in all the issue where there is issue; which were enough to conclude against all such marriages is bastardy, not gentilisme. For bastardy in the issue proves the supposed marriage not to be right, but gentilisme in the issue concludes nothing against the marriage: Ergo, the uncleanenes here is bastardy, not gentilisme. And thus he hath unawares given the medium of an argument against himself. To my second argument for matrimoniall sanctification, he saith. I know you cannot ignorantly, and therefore I feare you wilfully mistake; the meaning is, you may live together: for all the seed you beget are holy, infallibly, and necessarily holy, as the seed of infidels (neither parent believing) are necessarily & infallibly unclean; so that here is a future certainty, and not a contingency; & it is not possible to imagine a more full and determinate answer. I o

1 Cor 7. 14. is  
not meant of  
instrumentall  
sanctification  
and federall  
holinesse.

*An Apologie for the two Treatises*

which I say I am sure Mr *Blake* is mistaken, whether ignorantly or wilfully, I determine not; for he speaks of certainty of the holiness of the children in the latter part of the verse, whereas the question is whether instrumentall sanctification for the begetting a holy issue; of which the sanctification in the fore part of the verse is expounded, be contingent or no: and this I am sure is true, and therefore their lawfull living together for present according to Mr *Blakes* exposition should be taken from a future contingent, which *Chamier* truly counted absurd, though as happy a Logician as he was, he foresaw not how it served against himselfe. *Bernardus non videt omnia.*

To my third argument he saith. *Here you beg the question and reason flat against the Apostle. That sanctifying which the Apostle mentions is a result of the faith of the beleaving yoke-fellow, the unbeliever is twice said to be sanctified, but not the beleever; the beleever doth sanctify, if any sense can be made of the Apostles argument.* I answer. *He begs the question, who supposeth what he should prove: Mr Blake doth not, nor can shew I doe so; nor doe I reason flat against the Apostle; the Apostle no where saith the sanctifying is the result of the faith of the beleaving yoke-fellow, if it were so, an unbelieving fornicatour might be said to be sanctified by his beleaving whore, as well as a husband by his beleaving wife. The unbeliever is said twice to be sanctified, because the doubt arose from his unbeliefe; but the faith of the beleever is not at all expressed, to shew that the faith did not sanctifie, but the relation. But if it were meant of instrumentall sanctification, it would come from Gods designation, not the faith of the one party. For whose instrument should he be that is sanctified for begetting a holy seed but Gods? now to this nothing is answered, and so this argument stands good against Mr Blake.*

To my fourth argument he saith. *Understanding the Apostle of instrumentall sanctification and of federall holiness, the proposition [their children could not be holy without that sanctification] is most true, necessarily and universally true, at the issue of such a birth, they are federally unclean and unholy; if afterwards by grace they are changed, this is no fruit of their birth, of which the question is in this place, but of the Gospell work in their soules. To which I say the question is not here what is the fruit of birth, but how the*  
*Proposition*



Proposition can be true understood of federall holinesse, and instrumentall sanctification. And I say it is most certainly false, for many a child of both unbelieving parents are federally holy. But saith Mr *Blake*, they are not so at their birth. But this is nothing to the purpose, sith the Proposition hath not those words in it, nor the Apostle. The Apostles reason supposeth it cannot be at any time. And yet it may bee certaine that the child of two unbelievers may be federally holy at birth whether it be understood of election, inherent holinesse, or outward holinesse, if God please to work and declare it. But the issue of them that are not lawfully conjoynd as husband and wife, cannot be made legitimate by God, because it is contrary to the definition of legitimation, which is a state consequent upon birth by the lawfull copulation of lawfull husband and wife.

To my Analysis of the Apostles argument, Mr *Blake* saith the last words; *else were, &c.* may be a *medians*, and a resolution of another doubt too: but that cannot be, sith it is an argument and that is never drawn from the thing in doubt, but *a notiori*; and that *ab absurdo* which they would not yeeld, but the contrary was certain to them.

Mr *Blake* mislikes not my forming the Apostles argument, but he excepts against the Proposition I conceive the Apostles sequele presupposeth; which is, *All the children of those parents whereof the one is not sanctified to the other, are unclean.* To this saith Mr *Blake*. I appeal to your selfe, whether the truth of that sequel, by you rightly laid down, doe depend upon that Proposition which you draw from thence. I answer, it doth. Mr *Blake*. Is the Apostles major Proposition of parents in generall, or of one parent believing, and another unbelieving in particular? I answer, it is of an unbelieving husband and a wife. And yet the Proposition must be must be of all parents which must prove it, as he that will prove, if an Englishman be noble he is honourable, must prove it by this universall or generall. All noble men are honourable, and not put in, all English men noble; for then the antecedent and conclusion would be all one: whereas the Proposition proving must be larger then the Proposition proved; else we might conclude, *ex meris particularibus*. To say if the unbelieving husband were not sanctified

Enriched by the wife your children were unclean, is all one with this. All the children of the unbelieving husband not sanctified to the wife, are uncleane. Mr *Blake* saith, *The truth of the Apostles sequelle depends on this Proposition, All the children of an unbeliever are unclean, unlesse for generation, he or shee be sanctified by a beleever.* I deny it, for the termes for generation by a beleever are added by him, not in the Apostle; and so he changeth the terms. Yet it is to be noted that though the Apostles major be of husband and wife in particular, Mr *Blake* makes the Proposition on which it depends of unbelievers in generall, and so by his own prauiſe justifies me against his owne exception. 2. The Proposition Mr *Blake* layes down as upon which the major in the Apostle syllogisme depends. *All the children of an unbeliever are unclean, unlesse for generation he or shee be sanctified by a beleever,* is false; and so is that which he saith after. *All those that are borne of unbelieving parents, and one of them not sanctified in the other, are out of the Covenant of grace, yea the other is false too,* according to Mr *Blakes* opinion; unbelieving parents never beget children by birth-priviledge holy. For children born of infidels brought into *Abrahams* family had right to circumcision, and so were by birth-priviledge holy in Mr *Blakes* sence. Mr *Blake* tels me, the Apostles Proposition according to my interpretation is this. *All the children of an unbeliever are bastards, except in generation he or shee be sanctified by a beleever.* But this I deny: I have set down the Proposition according to my interpretation plainly enough already.

My alleaging *Chamiers* words against his opinion was no jeare, but a right way of using an authors reasons against another, against his own opinion. And that I did rightly, for these Propositions according to *Chamiers* explication are included in the Apostles reason. *omnes nati ex his parentibus quorum aliter non sanctificatur in alio sunt extra fœdus gratiæ. Nunquam parentes infideles gignunt liberos intra fœdus gratiæ futuros.* The adding [ *futuros* ] was necessary, because their being in the Covenant of grace is after their begetting; if I had said, *qui fuerunt aut sunt intra fœdus gratiæ,* Mr. *Blake* would justly then have had exception against me as not rightly setting down *Chamiers* conceits: now those Propositions of *Chamier* are false, and consequently his explication according to his



his own grounds. The putting in [*aut fornicantes*] was, because I would include both explications of the forepart of the verse, both that of matrimoniall, which I conceive was *Beza's*, and that of instrumentall sanctification. The using of the term *ridiculus*, was no more a jeer of *Chamier* then his using of it a jeare of *Augustin*. But my Anagonists are so touchy, that expressions that are not so much as moles in other mens eyes are beames in mine.

To the exceptions of Master *Blake*. pag. 40. I say, though I did not keep his words, yet I keep the effect of them. If he use not the term *Covenant of grace*, yet I suppose he will not deny he meant that which usually Divines expresse by it in this point, though Master *Blake* thinks the word *Covenant of grace* cannot be found in his treatise for baptism, yet if he please he may find the word *Covenant of free grace*, pag. 14. of his birth priviledge used to that purpose I ascribe to him where he saith, *the holinesse he maintaines is from the Covenant of free grace to all in the faith, and their seed*. My explication of the meaning of the Apostles words Master *Blake* sayes is almost the same with his in terminis. Then I have not wronged the Apostle, and it followes the Apostle calls himselfe a Jewe by nature, as tied to keep the law of *Moses*. Now I called it a dreame to make *Gal. 2.15. 1 Cor. 7.14.* every way parallel, they neither agreeing in scope, occasion, words, nor matter, which are dissimilitudes enough. I grant his sense of the word *nature*, and that the Apostle there speaks of himselfe and other Jewes as in reputation more holy then the Gentiles, because of their interest in circumcision and observance of *Moses* law, but this was proper to the Jewes in that Church-state, who had prerogatives peculiar to them. Master *Rutherford* *Due right of Presbyteries.* chap. 4. sect. 5. pag 192. *That they had prerogatives above us is cleare, Rom. 3.1,2,3. Rom. 9.4.* But I deny that, a holinesse of birth flowing from a parent beleeving, and in Covenant is asserted, *1 Cor. 7.14.* The term *sinners* of the Gentiles is not all one with *uncleane*, *1 Cor. 7.14.* But the chiefe thing he brings that text for, is to prove that our children have a Covenant holinesse because they are to be comprehended under the first member of the distinction *Jewes by nature*. I wondered at this his collection, but it seems Master *Blake* takes the term *Jewes* not properly

S. 9.  
Of M *Blake's*  
misallegation  
of *Gal. 2.15.*  
which was the  
text he chose  
for his birth-  
priviledge.

perly for people so called because borne in Judea, or of Jewish descent, but allusively as *Rom. 2. 28, 29*. But Master *Blake* doth not observe that the terme *Jewe* allusively taken is a term common to all godly people, or beleevers, whereas here Jew is taken as opposite to them that are of the Gentiles; and the denomination of a Jew allusively taken is not from nature or birth, as here Master *Blake* rightly expounds the word *nature*, but from faith, as the term *seed of Abraham*, and the *Israel of God*, and the term *circumcision* *Philip. 3. 3*. so that Master *Blakes* owne exposition overthrowes his owne inference. But then saith Master *Blake*, our children must be under [*sinners of the Gentiles*] and so they are *aliens dogs without hope, &c. Ephes. 2. 12*. I answer, our children are of the Gentiles, who were sinners, and as the Apostle speaks *Ephes. 2. 12*. at that time that went before their calling *strangers from the Covenant of promise, &c.* But it doth not follow that he that saith our children are of the Gentiles, who were once strangers from God, and so called sinners according to their condition then, must hold that they are so now. The most godly beleever now is under the second member of the distinction, being born of Gentile parents, and yet not as the Gentiles were then, stranger from Christ. Master *Blake* is most vaine in saying, *that by my te- not there were no more hope of the salvation of a Christians Infant then of Numa*, I acknowledge no such matter, nor doth any such thing follow from my words, which are plaine and true; Master *Blake* should, if he would have dealt fairly; have shewed out of which words, and how that followes which he obtrudes on me. When I said *the Jewes birth priviledge did not intitle them to the Covenant of grace*, I meant the same with the Apostle, *Ro. 9. 8* yet they had this benefit by their birth that they were among the people of God, had the priviledge of circumcision according to the Church-state then, were to eat the passeover; come into the Inner court of the Temple, had the law, Christ was to come of them, *Row. 9. 4, 5. Rom. 3. 1, 2*. and yet many of them not children of the promise. The Covenant of grace being made by God doth promise to all and every person to whom that Covenant is made, that he shall be effectually wrought upon. I said, *the common priviledge of circumcision belonging to the Jewes, did not arise from the Covenant of grace, according to the substance of it;*



but according to the administration that then was. My meaning was circumcision was common to them which had no part in the Covenant made with *Abraham*, *Gen. 17.* neither an interest in the Evangelicall, nor household promises made to *Abraham*, as for instance *Ismael*: and therefor I say it did not arise from the Covenant of grace, or parents faith as the formal reason why Infants were circumcised, but from Gods command according to that Church-state that then he thought good to appoint. This being clear from *Gal. 3 & 4.* Master *Blake* interprets it, as if I had said circumcision was not a signe of the substance of the Covenant, and runs out in a large discourse to prove the contrary; which toucheth not me who have expressly granted it *Exercit: pag. 3. Examen pag. 39, &c.* And it is a meer calumny in Master *Blake*, to tell me that I close with the *Jesuites*, and with high disdain shake off the doctrine of the *Protestants*. But saith Master *Blake*, pag. 43. you say in your *exercitation*, pag. 2. The Covenant made with *Abraham* is not a pure Gospel Covenant, but mixt. In the same place I explaine my meaning, and prove it so fully, that I wonder that Master *Marshall*, Master *Blake* and others are not ashamed to except against it. What the *Jesuites* say in this matter, or what the *Protestants* say against them, I have not time to examine. The thing, as I deliver it, is plaine according to Scripture: that there were some peculiar promises made to *Abraham*, *Ge. 17.* which are not made to every beleever. To tell us that godlinesse hath the promise of the life that now is, *1 Tim. 4. 8.* is nothing to the present purpose, for it doth not follow therefore that godlinesse hath the promise of the Land of *Canaan*, or that Christ should be every godly mans seed, &c. Mr *Blake* saith, circumcision was a fruit of the faith of the parents, but this is false; for then all, & none but children of beleivers were to be circumcised, which is not true: whose children soever they were, if in *Abraham*s house, if bought with money of any stranger, they were to be circumcised, I had said, circumcision was a priviledge in that time of the Churches minority, and this the Apostle delivers, *Gal. 3. & 4.* Mr *Blake* takes it as if I had said, the fruition of the promises in such a latitude, were onely a priviledge during the time of the Churches minority, and would have me give some Scripture or colour of reason for it, which is to impose on me the proving of that I affirme

*An Apologie for the two Treatises*

firme not. I said, he that will prove the birth priviledge of our children from the Jewes, must make our case as theirs, and so bring us under the ceremoniall law. This Master Blake puts into a formall proposition of his owne, a man of straw and then denies it, the reason of my words is plaine, circumcision of Infants was from the pedagogy, or peculiar Church-state of the Jewes, as may be proved from *Gal. 3.25. Gal. 4.1,2,3.* and obliged to the ceremoniall law, *Gal. 5.3.* therefore, they that from hence would draw the birth priviledge of our children, must make our case the same with the Jewes, and so bring us under the ceremoniall law. The rest of that section is vaine, and not worth a line in answer. I said truly, that the interpretation of *1 Cor. 7.14.* of legitimation is no more to be called a singular opinion then Master *Blakes*, and that I have proved by alleaging eleven Authors for it, and can do more.

§ 8.  
That *1 Pet. 2.9.*  
is meant of the  
Church invisi-  
ble:

To the 8th chapter, what he sayes of Doctor *Wilmot* I assent to: he was a precious man, and my dear friend; when Master *Blake* shall demonstrate to me what passages in my booke of *scandals* are inexcusable, I shall endeavour some way or other to retract them. Why I did not alter one or two passages, that Doctor *Wilmot* excepted against, I shall be willing to give Master *Blake* the reason. Master *Blake* is mistaken in that he saith, that my friend of the Assembly that delivered my letter to Master *Marshall*, was the man that told me of the Committee of the Assembly, and advised me to present the reasons of my doubts to them; it was not he, but my reverend and deare Father in law. And that friend of mine of the Assembly, that delivered my letter to Mr *Marshall*, tels me that though he was desirous to have Master *Blakes* book printed, that the point might be disputed; yet he did not approve many of his proofes: but by his speech with me lately, I conceive he did except at sundry of the same things which I did. But to the matter of that chapter. Letting passe the conference, and the occurrence therein, which was promised should not be divulged by any hearers, nor was there any exact record kept of it; the dispute is now brought to writing, the question is whether *1 Pet. 2.9* prove a birth priviledge of Christians, equall to the nation of the Jewes. I deny it, and say the words there are meant of the Church as it is invibile. And to prove this.

I I argue



1 I argue from the termes, *chosen generatiō, royall priest-hood, holy nation, peculiar people, or a purchased people*, that is by Christs death, *Tit. 2. 14.* which cannot be affirmed of any other then elect and true beleevers, *ergo.*

2 From that which is said of them that were called by God, by his power or vertue, into his marvailous light, and *v. 10.* that now had obtained mercy which they had not before, which cannot be affirmed of any but elect persons, and true beleevers, *ergo.*

3 It is said, *v. 7.* that these persons did beleeve, contradistinguished to them that were disobedient and stumbled at the word, to which they were appointed, but such are onely the elect, *ergo.*

4 *v. 5.* They are said to be built as living stones on Christ, a spirituall house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spirituall Sacrifice acceptable to God by Jesus Christ, which can agree to none but elect persons, and true beleevers, *ergo.*

But the terme nation comprehends Fathers and Children. Answ. The word nation, taken in these passages must be understood restrainedly of a spirituall people, as is plaine by considering that the Apostle *Gal. 3. 8.* sayes this is the Gospell, in thee shall all nations be blessed; that is, beleevers of all nations: else the Apostles collection *v. 9.* were not right. And so the word Kinred is used *Acts 3. 25.* compared with *Ephes. 3. 15.* the word household, *Ephes. 2. 19.* But they may be said to beleeve with a dogmaticall faith. Answ. Those that do so never come to Christ as living stones, nor are built a spirituall house, which is proper to them that are made an habitation of God through the spirit, *Ephes. 2. 22.* But the calling of a people is spoken of the ten tribes revolted, *Hos. 1. 10. Hos. 2. 23. Dent. 32. 21.* Answ. However it be in the places to which the allusion is, it is certaine that here is meant such a calling, as is from darkenesse to his marvailous light by his vertues or powers; which therefor deserve to be shewed forth, and which they do shew forth that are thus called. And this is confirmed from *Rom. 9. 24. 25. 26.* which is manifestly said of them who were called *v. 23.* vessels of mercy; nor is this a denomination a parte praestantiori, for it is expressly said: *v. 25.* were the same whom he called vessels of mercy. And I still say that I wonder Master Blake would persist in maintaining so grosse an abuse of this Scripture; in which I hardly beleeve any approved writer joynes with him.

S 11.  
Of precedents  
for womens  
receiving the  
Lords Supper.

Master Blake had said no particular provision for womens receiving the Lords Supper, more then for this of Infants-baptisme. I alleaged 1 Cor. 11. 28. where I said ~~disputum~~ comprehends both sexes. To this Master Blake sayes ch. 9. if arguments from the Grammer use be of force, then circumcision of femals may be proved from John 7. 22. I reply, the subject matter of the command as well as the Grammer use of the word prove femals to be included. Master Coleman an Assembly man, and an able linguist in his *male dicis*, pag. 32. hath these words. But that I confesse is something harsh, that he should aske me where there is an institution for women to receive the Sacrament: when in 1 Cor. 11. 28. is as cleare for women as men. Mr Martin Blake in his answer to Master Benjamin Coxe ch. 7. sect. 4. pag. 82. produceth many places where ~~in dispute~~ is as much *quisque* any one, *Matth. 16. 26. Joh. 3. 27. & 7. 46. Gal. 6. 1. &c.* I alleaged for an expresse example of womens receiving the Lords Supper, 1 Cor. 10. 17. & 1 Cor. 12. 13. and this I did in the Pulpit at Gabriel Fench-Church, as Mr Blake tels me; and I had fit occasion sith 1 Cor. 10. 17. was my text then, and that text is expresse without consequence for womens receiving the Lords Supper, if [*we*] comprehend women as well as men, which Master Blake will not deny. And yet Mr Malshalls allegation to prove women virtually to be circumcised in the males serves not for his purpose, I alleaged Acts 20. 7. Master Blake doubts whether it be meant of the Lords Supper, and if it be meant so, he knoweth not how to avoid the Popish argument for Communion in one kinde; and that this yeelds a proove onely by consequence. I answer, if women be comprehended under the terme Disciples, and breaking bread be meant of the Lords Supper, as to me it seems certaine; because it was the end of their customary meeting on the first day of the weeke, and therefore could not be any other breaking bread; then the example is expresse without consequence, for womens receiving the Lords Supper. If Mr Blake know not how to answer the Papists, I wish him to read Chamier *panstrat. Cathol. rom. 4. de Euch. lib. 9. c. 2. §. 34. &c.* Master Blake would bring Acts 2. 47. for example farre more formal and expresse then mine of Infant-baptisme, and he tels me of a Syllogisme. The Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved,



saved, Infants are saved, therefore are to be baptized. A strange syllogisme, where in the major terminum is not in the major proposition at all, consisting of four termes; and so farre as I can gather in *secunda figura ex omnibus affirmantibus*: for the medium [saved] is the predicate in both premisses, or else the major is particular, and so it consists *ex meris particularibus*.

I go on to the 10th chapter. I said, that it is a new Gospell to affirm that this is one of the promises of the Covenant of grace, that God will be the God of beleivers and their seed. To this Mr Blake saith, *A very high charge from that mouth which very lately, preached it as a Gospell truth; and now being suddenly otherwise persuaded, can bring no other arguments then those that are borrowed from Antichristian sectaries, who are confessed subverters of the Gospell.* I answer, Master Blake cannot prove that I ever preached that Doctrine, I scarce thinke I did ever preach it: Forasmuch as I conceived, that Doctrine directly contradictory to the Apostle, *Rom. 9. 8.* ever since in Oxford I examined *Armianus* his *Analysis* of *Rom. 9.* Suddenly I was not persuaded as I shew in my Apology before. I knowe not what Antichristian sectaries he means who are confessed subverters of the Gospell from whom I borrowed my arguments; I neither had them from Anabaptists, so called, nor Papists: Master Blake gives way to his passion in this charge. My arguments I have from Scripture, from the most learned Protestants, as he may see *Exampant. 3. 54.* And though it be an old Gospell, that God hath promised to be the God of *Abraham* and his seed, yet I still averre it to be a new Gospell, to say that God hath promised to be the God of beleivers and their seed. The Covenant with *Abraham* and his seed I find *Gen. 17. 7.* and the urging of this Covenant I deny not *Exod. 32. 13.* *Deut. 9. 27.* *Levit. 26. 42.* *Exod. 3. 6.* And though I say not that it contained onely the promise of *Canaan*, but grant it contained the promise of redemption by Christ, *Luke 1. 17.* yet I like not *Chamiers* saying, to call the promise of *Canaan* an appendant to the Covenant, sith the Holy Ghost me thinkes speakes otherwise, *Ps. 105. 8. 9. 10. 11.* That *Tertullians* words *de anima, cap. 39.* speak not of *Zwinglius* his federall holinesse hath been shewed before; and *Erasmus* his glosse on *Matth. 23.* which Master Blake cites pag. 57. saying that *Tertullian* call them *Candidatos fidei quod velut am-*

§ 12.

To say that God hath promised to be the God of every believer and his naturall seed is a new Gospell.

*biunt & expectant baptismum*, do me thinkes prove that Infants were not ordinarily baptized in his time. Nor do I thinke Master Blake can prove the Doctrine of Covenant-holinesse, out of Justin martyr, Epiphanius, Augustin, Isidor Pelusota.

§ 13.  
Of Mr Rutherford & Mr Blakes opinion about holinesse of a chosen nation, & mediate Ancestors profession intitling to Infant-baptisme, & the Independents advantage in this point.

I had said, that I guesse by some words of Master Marshall, Mr Blake and Master Rutherford, that to maintaine the baptizing of all sorts of persons in the Kingdome, as foundlings Infants of Papists, whores excommunicat persons, which is the ordinary practise; excepted against by Independents, that this assertion was upon the anvil: that when a nation shall receive the faith, that is a great or eminent part; the governours and chiefe cities and representative bodies shall receive the faith, that nation shall in like manner have all their little ones capable of baptisme, and counted visible members of the Church, as the posterity of the Jewes were in the time of that Church administration. Mr Blake askes me, in which of these words I pray you, can you find one word of that businesse which you say is on the anvil. I answer, to let Master Blakes words alone for the present, me thinkes Master Rutherfords sound plainly as much; For if notwithstanding the Father and Mother were as wicked as the Jewes, who slew the Lord of glory, who did obstinately deny Christ; the children were holy by the holinesse of the chosen nation, which I conceive when the Ancestors are not included, must meane the body, or generality of the nation; then the assertion I set downe as theirs must follow: but this I did deliver but as my guesse, yet so as that I thought necessary to oppose it; and I say, it opposeth their owne grounds, who derive the title to Infant-baptisme from the Covenant, to a beleever and his seed; but these are not the seed of beleevers, but the seed of them that deny and impugn the faith; and from 1 Cor. 7. 14. of which Master Blake himselfe saith pag. 38. of his answer to my letter. The truth of the Apostles sequel depends on this proposition, All the children of the unbeliever are uncleane, (that is out of the Covenant in his sense) unlesse for generation he or she be sanctified by a beleever. Which speech of Master Blake I conceive plainly overthrowes Master Blakes position in the birth-priviledge, pag. 24. &c. and Master Rutherfords in the words before named. For if all the children of an unbeliever are uncleane, unlesse for generation he or she be sanctified by a beleever, it will not be



be enough to say the nation is holy, or the mediate ancestors were holy, sith the Apostles position is of the immediate parents, about whose living together the question was, and therefore saith, *else were your children unclean*. Mr Blake's answer here is a mistake of the force of my reason, which was not from the term [*beleever*] in 1 Cor. 7. 14. but from this that by their own exposition, they are unclean who are not borne of a beleever, therefore they cannot be holy either by holinesse of remote ancestours or the chosen nation, when the immediate parents are as wicked as the Jewes who crucified Christ. I said the Independents had the advantage in this, and I am sure they have against Mr Blake and Mr Kutherford, and I guesse that the Assembly were sensible of it, when they appointed in the *Directory* the child to be presented by the Father, though I conceive that remedy will little or nothing rectify the abuse. Mr Blake saith it were worth enquiry whom I mean by officiating Priests. I tel him, non-preaching Priests made by the Bishops. Mr Blake saith, *your selfe were well aware, that every weapon that you list up against this Protestant doctrine was forged on the Jesuites anvill, and that in the whole conflict you were necessitated to borrow help from the Philistin Artists, when you were put upon it* so say page 13. This is no undeniable Axiome, that, what all the Protestant Divines defend against the Papists, must be truth undeniable. To this I say, I am well aware that this is a loud calumny, the contrary whereof is manifest by the many and best Protestant Divines I quote all along my *Examen*, and very seldome make use of a Jesuite throughout my Treatise. Nor was I put upon that speech I used, because I borrowed help from Papists; but because Mr Marshall spake of his virtuall consequence as undeniable, as if he had been *Doctor irrefragabilis*, and it is necessary when men goe about to bind men to the consent of Divines in some Churches, that we freely claime our liberty, and not become the servants of men. Mr Blake saith *I doe not know one Protestant writer that hath declared himselfe in this thing, but hath declared himselfe to be your adversary*. I answer, none of the Antipædobaptists are my adversaries in this; yet some of them are Protestant writers: in the point of expounding Gen. 17. 7. which is the chiefe hold for Covenant holinesse, Twisse, Bayne, Ames, Downe, and many others are for me, in the point of expounding;

1 Cor. 7. 14. *Camerarius, Melancthon, Musculus, Osiander*, are for me. Mr *Blake* saith but a little before, pag. 58. *Zwinglius* on this hand went right, in which Luther his contemporary and opposite in this thing, is charged to be defective. But saith Mr *Blake*, I and you have entred into Covenant to the extirpation of Popery; and I would learn of you by what character or marks it may be now discerned. I answer, not by this, that that is to be accounted Popery which all Protestant Divines oppose the Papists in; for then many things would not be counted Popery which are, nor any thing to be counted Popery till we knew all Protestant Divines oppose it: an endles, impossible busines. But there is a shorter way then that, and it is that is to be counted Popery which is commonly known by that name, as the doctrine of the Popes supremacy, infallibility, the doctrine of the Masse, Transubstantiation, Bread-worship, Crosse-worship, Invocation of Saints, &c. Or if you will have a more fixed way, you may take that to be Popery which either the 39 Articles of the Church of England condemn in opposition to Papists; or is renounced in the Scottish negative Covenant, or Confession in the yeare 1581 as I remember, or what the present Parliament of England in their late Propositions to the King, *Propos. 7.* would have Papists abjure. Mr *Blake* saith, may we not require one other instance of a Popish truth standing up against an Orthodox error, besides this in controversy? That from *Gen. 17. 7. 1 Cor. 7. 14.* or any other Scripture Covenant-holines of beleivers infants cannot be proved is as well a Protestant truth, as a Popish; An Orthodox error is, oppositum in opposito. Be it that we cannot assign any one thing for truth in which Protestants generally oppose Papists; yet my speech is good, that that is no undeniable axiome, that what all the Protestant Divines defend against the Papists, must be truth undeniable. He that will not subscribe to this, must make the Protestant Divines doctrines against Papists, equal to the holy Scripture.

## §. 14.

Of the word

[nation] Mar.

28. 19. how to

be taken.

In the 11th chapter Sect. 1. Mr. *Blake* subscribes to my interpretation, and conclusion, but doubts the premises on which I build it to be scarce sound, the reason he gives is, because I have expounded make Disciples out of all nations, whereas the verb is transitive, and the noun in the accusative; and therefore it is boldnesse in me to change it, that in stead of nations I may understand as many or as few



few as I list of nations, whereas Mr Blake conceives agreeable to prophecies, Psal. 2. 8. &c. that the whole of the nation is appointed to be discipled, and to be baptized, and so infants to be comprehended. I answer, my boldnesse was no other then Beza's, annot. on Mat. 28. 19, *mandatum, id est discipulos mihi facite ex omnibus gentibus.* The new annotations on the Bible annot. on Matth. 28. 19. teach } *Gr. make Disciples of, as John 4. 1. all nations* } nor Jewes alone, but Gentiles also; Acts 10. 34. 35. 47. nor do I any thing contrary to Grammar, as the verb is transitive, so it is used transitively by me, and it hath an accusative case after it, to wit the noun confessedly included in the verb that is made from it, and which I think none will deny to be the same with *οὐκ ἐστι μανδύκας* used John 4. 1. and then all nations must either be put by apposition *οὐκ ἐστι μανδύκας ὡς τὰ ἔθνη*, or with the Preposition *οὐκ ἐστι μανδύκας ἐν τῷ ὅλῳ κόσμῳ*, I stand not upon it whether be taken, but I conceive it more agreeable to the sense, and to the language to expresse it in the latter way. But then the whole of the nation, and so infants will not be included. I answer, it is true, nor can they be included. For the making Disciples all nations is by reaching them, or by preaching the Gospell to them; as the word *μανδύκας* is expressed, *Μαρκ. 16. 15.* (which no man I think will have the face to deny to bee the same with this) not onely Master Marshall himselfe thus expresseth it in his Sermon pag. 35. that they should teach the heathen and the Jewes and make them Disciples, and then baptize them; but Mr Blake subscribes to this my interpretation, by preaching the Gospell to all nations, make them Disciples. pag. 63. So that Mr Blake must needs exclude infants, except he can make them Disciples by reaching or preaching the Gospell to them. And for the prophecies he brings, I marvaile he is not ashamed to produce, Psal. 72. 11. Psal. 86. 9. to prove that that the whole of the nation even infants must be included, Mar. 28. 19. as if it were foretold that the whole of the nations even infants should come and worship before God. Pareus in his Commentary on Matth. 28. 19. saith truly, *tertium mandatum est de baptizandis omnibus gentibus, hoc est sacramento baptismi initiandis & consecrandis omnibus iis qui Christo nomen darent.*

In the second section of chapter 14. Master Blake saith, I had thought no man had equal'd Bellarmine in taking paines to find a knot

S. 15.

Of M. Rutherford and Mr Blakes and mine opinion concerning the rule to know who are baptizable.

*An Apologie for the two Treatises*

knot in a Bull-rush. But I have shewed above that Mr Rutherford hath made a knot, needfull to be untied. I say, there can no rule be assigned whereby to know when a nation is a beleeving, chosen, or disciplined nation, giving right to baptize infants of that nation when not. Mr Blake asks, doe you mean rules so cleare and plaine that no difficulty or case of conscience can occurre, that needs enquiry in observation of it. I answer no, but such rules as are so cleare that a case of conscience may be resolved by them. Mr Blake accuseth me as not rightly setting down his argument, because I set not down the conclusion right: I put the conclusion thus; and therefore the infants to be baptized, whereas I should have added: and the nations being disciplined, then infants as part of the nation are to be baptized. To shew the causlesnesse of this exception, Mr Blake pag. 20 of his birth-priviledge had said thus, *The infants of any nation make up a part of the nation, and the nation where they came was to be disciplined*; but set not down his conclusion, and therefore I conceiving he meant to infer thence that infants were comprized in those words, *baptizing them*, *Matth. 28. 19.* put down his conclusion thus, *and therefore the infants to be baptized*. Mr Blake would have *disciplined* put into the conclusion. But I conceive still *disciplined* should not be put in the conclusion, and the premises were set down by himselfe, and therefore I did him no wrong. For his argument in form must be thus. They who are part of a disciplined nation are to be baptized, infants are part of a disciplined nation, therefore infants are to be baptized; any man may see that *disciplined* should not be put in the conclusion, sith it is in the *medium, quod non ingreditur conclusionem*. Now let his major Proposition stand, and I will subsume upon Mr Blakes ground; Infidels of growne yeares are part of a disciplined nation, for they are part of the nation; and if the nation be disciplined, they are part of the disciplined nation: therefore by Mr Blakes reason, Infidels of growne yeares are to be baptized. Mr Blake at last pag. 67. sets downe his rule, in these words *they are baptized by vertue of a priviledge from their parent, not from the nation*: which is plainely to renounce Mr Rutherfurds assertion. I confesse if my first argument against the assertion I conceive Mr Rutherford may be answered, then the 2d. will be easily answered as Mr Blake truly observes, p. 68. In answering my 3d. Mr Blake asks, *How is it that wicked*  
*parents*



parents are now brought in this dispute? I answer because it was the term *Mr Rutherford* used in his assertion: not to shew my allowance of the baptisme of infants of parents not wicked, nor out of agreement with *Mr Thomas Goodwin* in this. *Mr Blake* page 69. *indeavours to prove by my tenet there can be no rule set down to know that any man is baptizable, because he conceives I hold onely true beleevers before God, members of the invisible Church, vessels of mercy, redeemed ones are the men discipled to be baptized; but who are such, cannot be known. Ergo, by my opinion none are to be baptized.* *M. Blake* *indeavours to gather that to be my opinion out of my words, which are brought in oborto collo, against their intent, nothing to his purpose. I say that Mr Marshals words in this sense are good, beleevers of every nation are the peculiar people meant; 1 Pet. 2. 9. and this is meant of the invisible Church, and that God hath not chosen simply the nation of the Gentiles, but a people out of them: Revel. 5. 7. but doe I there by expound Matth. 28. 19. as if [nations] there comprehended only such elect persons and true beleevers? or doe I any where say, that such only are Disciples and to be baptized? Why then doth Mr Blake not onely here, but after in another chapter to wit the 14 of his book pag. 95, 96. endeavour to fasten so absurdly that upon me, when he himselfe twice in this very book p. 24. 50. acknowledgeth, that he hath heard it from my own mouth, that baptisme is rightly administred to every professour of Chrutt. I say pag. 158 of my *Examen*, that infants being sanctified are beleevers, and discipled of Christ; but I no where say, a sanctified person a beleever, and a Disciple to be the same, as Mr Blake untruly chargeth me, pag. 96. for I doe not make the termes reciprocal. Nor is that the advantage which I say the Independents have in this point, that the holinesse that is the ground for the administratour to baptize, must be reall either indeed or charitably beleaved; but this is the advantage I conceive the Independents have, that whereas some will have children baptized though the parents be never so wicked: if they be a part of a beleevving nation, or their mediate Ancestours professed the faith, the Independents have advantage against them by their own plea; from *Gen. 17. 7. 1 Cor. 7. 14.* as I shewed above. In like manner *Master Blake* chapter 14. page 93. because I said that Infants may by*

T

extraor-

*An Apologie for the two Treatises*

extraordinary power be made Disciples, as God made *John Baptist* leap in his mothers womb, and *Balaams* ass speak, inferres against all reason and candor, thus. *You hold this is done by the omnipotent power of God, as usually as actuall faith and profession of it is wrought in them; as asses are made to speake with mans voice, and children in the womb leap for joy at the sensible presence of one that speakes to their mother. These you joyn together, so that this is the comfort that you leave to parents when infants beleive, make profession of their faith, asses speake, and infants in the womb know a voyce and rejoyce upon hearing it, then their children may be sanctified, and dying in infancy saved.* But what spirit is *Mr Blake* possessed with that he so unbrotherlike perverts my words to make me odious? *I say that infants are sanctified by extraordinary power, not by ordinary means as hearing the word, doe I therefore make this unusual? It may be done in every infant of a beleever for ought I say to the contrary. But you make it an extraordinary accident when you use this passage both p. 134, & 158. extraordinary accidents make not an ordinary rule.* 'Tis true I use the passage in both places, but do not in either make the extraordinary accident to be an infants sanctification, but in the one an infants profession of faith, as the very words shew, pag. 134. and in the other the extraordinary revelation, as is easie to be perceived by him that reads, pag. 158 of my *examen*. And thus have I answered with sect. 2. ch. 11. the fourteenth chapter also of *Mr Blakes* book.

**S. 16.**

About two  
suppositions  
ascribed by me  
to Mr Marshall  
and Mr Blake  
in my *Examen*  
page 130.

Sect. 3. chap. 11. *Mr. Blake* chargeth me of imposing this supposition on him, that he should strongly conceit this, that *Christ* bid the *Apostles* baptize all nations after the manner that the *Jewes* did circumcise one nation, my meaning was that he conceived that as God appointed the *Jewes* to circumcise parents professing faith and their infants; so he bid the *Apostles* baptize beleieving parents, and their infants: I did not intend to charge him with this conceit, as if he conceived that *Christ* bid the *Apostles* set up circumcision, as he seems pag. 73. to imagine, but that he conceived they were to baptize all nations, Fathers and Infants in like manner as the *Jewes* circumcised Fathers and their Infants. And this I conceive still must bee his meaning, not knowing what other Covenant, and Covenant-initiating Sacrament he could meane restrained to one nation, besides the Covenant, *Gen. 17.* and circumcision



cumcision appointed to the Jewes. But Mr. *Blake* tels me *this was my calumny to say he would have the commission, Mat. 28. 19. to be expounded by the precept of circumcision, Gen. 17. has mea t the precept or commission; Matth. 10. 6.* I answer, Mr *Blake* would have the word *nations* Matth. 28. 19. to comprehend infants, and his reason is, because *the word nation was so taken, when the Covenant, and Covenant-initiating Sacrament was restrained to that one nation.* Now I appeale to any one whether in the commission, *Matth. 10. 6.* yea or in the whole chapter the word *nation* be taken as restrained to that one nation, or whether their commission was first limited, nor is there any mention of either of Covenant or Covenant-initiating Sacrament in that whole chapter, nor a word that shewes that the word *nation* in the Apostles commission comprehended infants. And therefore I could not divine more fairely then I did what Mr *Blake's* meaning should be in that obscure expression. But saith Mr *Blake* *you are not at the paines to make it appear how the words of Christ were to the Apostles intelligible, if the word nation in this enlarged Commission, must be taken in any other sense, and latitude then it was in their former limited commission when the Covenant and Covenant-initiating Sacrament was restrained to one nation.* To this I answer, I took paines I think sufficient to shew how it must be understood in my *Examen*, § 13. and therefore I shew how it was intelligible to the Apostles. Many interpreters have expounded the word, none that I know of expounded it by *Mat. 10. 6.* The commission *Mar. 16. 15.* is the same with *Mat. 28. 19.* and so expounds it without running to *Mat. 10. 6.* The other supposition that I conceived Mr *Marshall's* argument relied on is, *that the nation of the Jewes were discipled when circumcised.* This Mr *Blake* saith, *I put on him, but he disclaimes it.* The truth is, I did not put it on Mr *Blake*, but Mr *Marshall*; though the next words speak of Mr *Blake*: but not imputing to him the second, but the first supposition. As for Mr *Mar.* I do not find him disclaiming it. And for that inference that Mr *Blake* makes from my words, as if I conceived low thoughts of Mr *Blake* and Mr *Marshall*, because I say the conceit *that making Disciples, Mat. 28. 19. is to be done by baptizing them, is so absurd that I presume none that hath any wit will entertain it, now it is as absurd to say, that the Jewes were discipled when they were circum-*

*An Apologie for the two Treatises*

extraordinary power be made Disciples, as God made John Baptist leap in his mothers womb, and Balaams asse speak, inferres against all reason and candor, thus. *You hold this is done by the omnipotent power of God, as usually as actuall faith and profession of it is wrought in them; as asses are made to speake with mans voice, and children in the womb leap for joy at the sensible presence of one that speakes to their mother. These you joyn together, so that this is the comfort that you leave to parents when infants beleive, make profession of their faith, asses speake, and infants in the womb know a voyce and rejoyce upon hearing it, then their children may be sanctified, and dying in infancy saved. But what spirit is Mr Blake possessed with that he so unbrotherlike perverts my words to make me odious? I say that infants are sanctified by extraordinary power, not by ordinary means as hearing the word, doe I therefore make this unusual? It may be done in every infant of a beleever for ought I say to the contrary. But you make it an extraordinary accident when you use this passage both p. 134, & 158. extraordinary accidents make not an ordinary rule. 'Tis true I use the passage in both places, but do not in either make the extraordinary accident to be an infants sanctification, but in the one an infants profession of faith, as the very words shew, pag. 134. and in the other the extraordinary revelation, as is easie to be perceived by him that reads, pag. 158 of my examen. And thus have I answered with sect. 2. ch. 11. the fourteenth chapter also of Mr Blakes book.*

Sect. 3. chap. 11. Mr. Blake chargeth me of imposing this supposition on him, that he should strongly conceit this, that *Christ bid the Apostles baptize all nations after the manner that the Jewes did circumcise one nation*, my meaning was that he conceived that as God appointed the Jewes to circumcise parents professing faith and their infants; so he bid the Apostles baptize beleieving parents, and their infants: I did not intend to charge him with this conceit, as if he conceived that *Christ bid the Apostles set up circumcision*, as he seems pag. 73. to imagine, but that he conceived they were to baptize all nations, Fathers and Infants in like manner as the Jewes circumcised Fathers and their Infants. And this I conceive still must bee his meaning, not knowing what other Covenant, and Covenant-initiating Sacrament he could meane restrained to one nation, besides the Covenant, Gen. 17. and circumcision

S. 16.

About two suppositions ascribed by me to Mr Marshall and Mr Blake in my Examen page 130.



cumcision appointed to the Jewes. But Mr. *Blake* tels me *this was my calumny to say he would have the commission*, Mat. 28. 19. to be expounded by the precept of circumcision, Gen. 17. *hee mea- t the precept or commission*; Matth. 10. 6. I answer, Mr *Blake* would have the word *nations* Matth. 28. 19. to comprehend infants, and his reason is, because the word *nation* was so taken, when the Cove- nant, and Covenant-initiating Sacrament was restrained to that one nation. Now I appeale to any one whether in the commissi- on, Matth. 10. 6. yea or in the whole chapter the word *nation* be taken as restrained to that one nation when their commission was first limited, nor is there any mention of either of Cove- nant or Covenant-initiating Sacrament in that whole chapter, nor a word that shewes that the word *nation* in the Apostles commis- sion comprehended infants. And therefore I could not divine more fairely then I did what Mr *Blake's* meaning should be in that obscure expression. But saith Mr *Blake* you are not at the paines to make it appear how the words of Christ were to the Apostles intel- ligible, if the word *nation* in this enlarged Commission, must be taken in any other sense, and latitude then it was in their former li- mited commission when the Covenant and Covenant-initiating Sa- crament was restrained to one nation. To this I answer, I took paines I think sufficient to shew how it must be understood in my *Examen*, § 13. and therefore I shew how it was intelligible to the Apostles. Many interpreters have expounded the word, none that I know of expounded it by Mat. 10. 6. The commission Mar. 16. 15. is the same with Mat. 28. 19. and so expounds it without running to Mat. 10. 6. The other supposition that I conceived Mr *Marshall's* argument relied on is, that the nation of the Jewes were discipled when circumcised. This Mr *Blake* saith, I put on him, but he disclaims it. The truth is, I did not put it on Mr *Blake*, but Mr *Marshall*; though the next words speak of Mr *Blake*: but not imputing to him the second, but the first supposition. As for Mr *Mar.* I do not find him disclaiming it. And for that inference that M. *Blake* makes from my words, as if I conceived low thoughts of Mr *Blake* and Mr *Marshall*, because I say the conceit that making Disciples, Mar. 28. 19. is to be done by baptizing them, is so absurd that I presume none that hath any wit will entertain it, now it is as absurd to say, that the Jewes were discipled when they were circum- cised,

cised, and therefore I conceive Mr Blake and Mr Marshall have not any wit. But for this inference it is a farre fetched thing : I did not conceive the one so absurd as the other, nor doe yet, and therefore I might impute defect of wit to the entertainer of the one conceit, and yet not impute it to Mr Marshall and Mr Blake, for entertaining another conceit like it. Mr Blake excepts against me for laying these points had strong hold in his mind, that baptisme succeeds into the room, place, and use of circumcision ; and that the Covenant of the Gospell is all one with the Covenant made with Abraham : For he used those words, that Baptisme so succeeds circumcision, therefore how could I know it to bee in his mind. I answer I knew it by words equipollent which hee useth as Birth-priviledge, page 14. what is objected against one, concludes against both : circumcision and baptisme are therefore by the Apostle promiscuously taken ; there being the same principall and maine end of both. And this is evidence enough for what I said. The other Proposition he denies not to be in his mind.

§.17.  
About arguments drawn from Analogy in positive rites and their invalidity : and the insufficiency of Mr. Blakes rules.

Sect.4. ch. 11. Mr Blake makes a digression concerning arguments drawn from Analogy. And first whereas I had allowed for that which is naturall or morall in worship, an institution or command in the old Testament as obligatory to christians : upon this Mr Blake tels me, *there is the same reason and like liberty in arguing by analogy in positive as in morall precepts.* To this I reply, if the meaning bee that there is like reason of proving morall precepts from the old Testament as positive rites, it is most false and contrary to the 7th article of the Church of England, but if it be understood of the manner of prooffe by analogy or resemblance, then I deny that wee have any liberty at all to argue from analogy or resemblance, to prove or make a dutie or command in morals or ceremonials, though I grant we may use analogy to inforce a duty before proved. For an argument to prove a thing to bee a morall dutie from the old Testament, must bee by proving the same thing, then to have been morall as Master Candray and Master Palmer endeavour to prove one day in seven for a Sabbath to bee morall and perpetuall, but an argument from analogy is from one thing to another, as like, for analogy or proportion is betweene, not the same but more things as like. As for the Apostles arguing, 1 Cor.9.9.

1 Tim.



1 Tim. 5. 18. the Apostle doth not by bare analogy conclude ministers maintenance, but from the Lords ordinance, 1 Cor. 9. v. 14. which ordinance I take to be that *Matth. 10. 10.* which ordinance the Apostle confirms from common equity, which he proves by diverse instances, from *v. 7. to v. 14.* so that the Apostle doth not prove a morall duty by analogy between two different things, but from a generall maxime that *the labourer is worthy of his reward* proved by sundy instances, inferres a particular truth concerning ministers. The argument 1 Cor. 10. 16. 17. is to prove, that they which professe Christ, may not partake of the things of Idols, from this generall truth that they which joyn in the service of any God they hold communion with that God, and are one with those that worship that God, thus the Apostle proves by instances in the Christian, and Jewish services. So that this argument is from a generall truth proved by an induction of instances. That *Matth. 12. 3. 4.* is onely an instance to prove that sacrifice must give place to mercy: a ceremoniall to a morall duty; not an argument from meer analogy or resemblance of things different. But what ever arguing there be in morals, certaine it is that no argument is good from bare analogy in ceremonials, or meer positives of the Jewes; to prove, thus it was in such a rite of the Jewes, therefore it must be so in such a rite of the Christians, there's no example of such arguing in the Scriptures, and therefore I said rightly *Examen pag. 29.* To me it is a dangerous principle upon which they goe that so argue, to wit, that in meer positive things (such as circumcision and baptisme are) we may frame an addition to Gods worship, from analogy, or resemblance conceived by us betweene two ordinances; whereof one is quite taken away without any institution gathered by precept or Apostolicall example. Master Blake would knowe who they be that do so, I answer, Mr Marshall in his first argument, and five first conclusions, and virtuall command from circumcision; Master Blake birth-priviledge pag. 15. and generally all that prove Infant-baptisme, by Infant-circumcision. For circumcision and baptisme, are meer positive things; baptizing of Infants is confessed not to have expresse institution gathered by expresse precept, or example in the new Test: and that which is alleaged, is either expresse, or no precept, or example at all: and if it were to be gathered by consequence from institution,

tion, or example Apostolicall in the new Testament, without the helpe of the precept of circumcision there would be, for as much as it concernes my part, an end of the controversie: therefore it is clear, they that argue from circumcision to baptisme, doe frame an addition to Gods worship, from analogy or resemblance conceived by them, between two ordinances: whereof one is quite taken away, without any institution gathered by precept, or Apostolicall example. But saith Master Blake. *It is not barely the analogy between circumcision and baptisme, by which we inforce the baptisme of Infants, but the grounds of both circumcision and baptisme.* This is laid, but when the grounds are required, what are they but the analogy between baptisme and circumcision, that they are like; what's the reason of the one, is the reason of the other: and therefore what is done in the one, is to be done in the other? Now whence is this arguing but barely from the likenesse, which makes an argument meerly from analogy. If the argument were drawn from some thing proper to baptisme it were another case, but being drawne from circumcision to baptisme, it is an argument meerly from analogy. If they rest not on this, let them lay aside this argument, and sticke to precept or Apostolicall example in the new Testament. To shew the danger of this way of arguing, I thus reasoned *Examen pag. 29.* For if we may do it in one thing, why not in another? where shall we stay? They that read the Popish expositors of their rituals do know, that this principle hath brought in surplice, purification of woman, &c. that I mention not greater matters. I desire any Learned man to set me downe a rule from Gods word, how farre I may go in my conceived parity of reason, equity or analogy, where I must stay; when it will be superstition and will-worship when not; when my conscience may be satisfied, when not. Master Blake in answer hereto, layes downe three rules. 1. *When parity of reason or analogy, doth not institute any peece of worship, or the least part of the service of God, but onely helpe to a right understanding of the nature, use, end, extent of that which is instituted.* 2. *When in our reasoning from analogy, from the right understanding of any institution, or ordinance, we do not rest sely on the analogy that we find with other commands, but have our further reason for confirmation.* 3. *When the analogy holds full proportion in that for which it is brought, so that nothing can*  
*fairly*



fairly be brought against the one, but may be also concluded against the other. To this I answer. 1 That never a one of these rules is brought out of Gods word. Not the first, for there is neither declaration of such a rule, nor example to prove that rule. The proving of excommunicating of women from Miriams shutting out of the camp, *Numb. 12. 14.* is not a Scripture collection, but a meer devise of men; the argument against nonresidence from *Ezek. 44. 8.* is good after other arguments, but without other prooffe is not convincing: and it is not in meer positive things but morall. The argument of the Apostle, *1 Cor. 9. 13. 14.* is not from one positive rite to another, but from an ordinance of God agreeable to common equity in the old Testament, to illustrate an ordinance in the new Testament, about a morall duty of righteousness. The second and third rules are not set downe from any declaration or example in the Scripture. 2 I say these rules are very uncertaine, For no reason is given why they may not make a new worship, who may by their analogy extend it beyond the institution in the new Testament. yea, it will be alleaged by Papists, and others, that when they appoint Surplice, Purification, Organs, &c. they do not make a new worship, but adde circumstances to the ordinances of Christ. Yea, The second rule overthrowes all, For if we may not soly rest on the analogy; why at all? This is enough to shew that analogy hath no strength, that indeed it doth onely illustrate cannot prove; what is an argument by analogy, but an argument *a simili*? If analogy could prove, we might rest soly on it, without any other confirmation. It is true, many desire more arguments, but in truth if it be an argument that proves, we may rely on it soly though there be no other. The third rule likewise is uncertaine and vaine. For how shall we knowe when the analogy holds full propottion? when nothing can be fairly brought against the one, but may be also concluded on the other? when is the proportion full, if onely when *omnia sunt paria*; this can never happen in analogies between the rites of *Moses* and rites of *Christ*? If when there is a parity in many things, it will be uncertaine how many parityes will serve turne to make the proportion full; what force there is in an analogy when there are more disparities: And so for a rule to knowe when a thing is fairly brought, whether the rule be to be taken from Logicke, or the judgement

*An Apologie for the two Treatises*

judgement of the Learned. So that these rules are very uncertain.  
 3 It is also uncertaine whether these rules be sufficient, whether there be no need of any more. For these rules will not exclude prooffe of imparity of ministers, Infant communion, &c by analogy. Or if they do the same aberration from these rules that disproves the analogy for these; will be incident to the analogy for Infant-baptisme. We may say Infant-communion, or imparity in the ministry is no more a new instituted worship, then Infant-baptisme; they that alleage analogy for imparity of the Clergy, and Infant-communion rest not soly on it; it seems to be brought as fairely with as full proportion in the one as the other. So that I conclude, not onely with Master Rutherford proportions are *weake proportions*, but also that in these positive rites, and institutions they are no probations at all, but meer illustrations, and consequently the argument for Infant-baptisme from the analogy of Infant-circumcision is a meer nullity.

The rest of the *section* containes nothing but wrong inferences from my words; I distinguish between Evangelicall promises and promises domesticall specially respecting *Abrahams family*, *If this distinction may passe then Abrahams family had no Evangelicall promises* saith Master Blake, you make saith he, an opposition between them. But what ridiculous arguing is this? It's all one as to say, If gifts of grace and nature are distinguished, then they that have gifts of grace, can have no gifts of nature. Those things that are not *idem formaliter*, or *realiter*, may be in *eodem subiecto*. I oppose them, he saith, but how? not as contraries, but as *disparata*, which is rather a distinction then an opposition. Because I say, *circumcision signified that Moses Law was to be observed*, Gal. 5.3. Master Blake excepts. You are (it seems) of Mr Blackwoods opinion, that saith, *circumcision did not bring any grace to the Jewes, but was rather a yoke or a curse*. Master Blackwood hath or may answer for himself. Mr Blakes inference from my words is a meer cavil. And that which he addes, that I make frequent use of *Bellarmines sophistry* is a meer slander. That circumcision signified the promise of the Land of *Canaan*, I had it not from *Bellarmino*, but if from any, rather from *Cameron* cited by me *exercit: pag. 4.* or rather from *Gen. 17.8. Psal. 105. 11.* This is enough in answer to that section.



That Mr Blake hath not proved that Infants are disciples from Mat. 18. 5. nor pertinently alleaged, *Isai.* 49. 22.

Sect. 5. ch. 11. Master Blake accuseth me as not setting down his argument rightly, but the truth is, I set not downe the argument as it is in Master Blake, but as it was in Master Marshall, whose very words I alleadge, and that rightly. But Master Blake thinks he formed it to better advantage; From *Matth.* 10. 42. *Mar.* 9. 41. compared, *I onely gather to that belong to Christ, and to beare the name of Christ, and to be a Disciple of Christ is one and the same thing.* But by his leave, if he should meet with a punctuall respondent, he would and might deny his prooffe. For all that he can prove from thence is, that the same persons that belong to Christ, are disciples of Christ; but it is not true alwayes, *qua eadem subjecta conveniunt sunt eadem formaliter.* He that should say, he that receives my servant receives me; he that receives one that belongs to me, receives me; though he speak both these of the same person, yet a servant, and one that belongs to him are not all one and the same thing: For there are other that belong to him, as wife, children, friends, besides servants. And indeed to belong to Christ, and to be a Disciple of Christ, are not one and the same thing. To be a Disciple of Christ in all the places in the four Evangelists and Acts of the Apostles, signifies no other then one that professed Christ to be his master, and followed his Doctrine, as the Disciples of *John*, the Pharisees, and others did follow their Doctrine; but many belong to Christ, yet uncalled, all that his Father hath given unto him, the Angels that are his Ministers belong to him, and yet cannot in the Scripture acception be termed Christs Disciples. But I assume saith Master Blake, that Infants are of the number of those who as Disciples in Christs account do belong to him. *Matth.* 18. 5. I said the word *audire* notes not alwayes an Infant, for *Jairus* daughter, though twelve yeare old is called *audire* *Marke* 5. 41. 42. and yet that age might be a patterne of humility; seldome are children of that age ambitious as the Disciples, though they be oft impatient. I said further that *Matth.* 18. 5. is not meant of a little child in age, and that I proved from *v.* 3. 4. 6. But saith Master Blake, he is indeed a child in understanding, that doth not see that your reference to *v.* 3. 4. is wholly against you for little child *v.* 3. 4. is taken for such a one as in age is a little child, else the speech would be inept. But Mr Blake should have heeded my words better, I did not parallel the word

An Apologie for the two Treatises

[little child] v.5. with [little child] v.3 4. but the phrase [one such little child] with the phrases, v.3. one that is converted, and made as a little child. v.4. one that humbles himselfe as a little child v.6. one of those little ones that beleeve in him. But saith Master Blake, Luke 9.48. it is *verum* *quod* *propter* *hunc* *puerulum*, fortassis legendum *hujusmodi* *puerulum*: & Grotius *id est*: *ut* *apud* *Mattheum*, *quomodo* *&* *hic* *Syrus* *interpretatur*. Tale est: *amor omnibus idem*. That in *Matth. 18.5* a little child must be meant of a little child in affection, seems plaine to me by the terme *such a one*, that it is not limited to that little child, the term shews which is as much as *quempiam* any one. And me thinkes the meaning of the words should be thus, whosoever should receive such a one as is as meane and low as a little child receiveth me, as that which followes makes me conceive. For he that is lesse among you, that is, though he were as meane as a little child, shall be great. But were it granted that it were meant of a little child in age, how doth it follow that such a one is there a Disciple? This, if any must be the prooffe: He that is received in Christs name, is a Disciple. A little child may be received in Christs name *ergo* a little child is a disciple. But of this argument, I deny the major; a person might be received in Christs name, who was not a Disciple, as those that did miracles in Christs name, and yet followed not Christ, *Luke 9.49*. But if it were so that it could be proved, that the terme Disciple is any where given to an Infant, (which neither Master Blake from *Matth. 18.5*. nor Master Marshall from *Acts 15.10*. can ever do) yet it is certaine that a Disciple *Matth. 28.19*. is such a one as is made by preaching the Gospell, as is manifest from *Mar. 16.15*. *John 4.1*. And I wonder that those very men that do in effect sometime confesse this is not meant of Infants, when they answer the Antipædobaptists objection from *Matth. 28.19*. as Mr Marshall pag. 44. of his Sermon, *It is said indeed, that they taught and baptized, and no expresse mention of any other*, that yet they should by such strained and forced inferences go about to draw a command from *Matth. 28.19*. for baptizing Infants, as if they might be called there Disciples, contrary to the constant use of the word throughout the new Testament, and their own confessed



cessionellwhere. *Sect. 6. ch. 11.* Master *Blake* blames me for putting his reason from *Isai 49. 22* as an argument by it selfe in my *exercitation*. But he might know my *exercitation* let downe most of the arguments as they were urged in the conference with me, And so was the reason from *Isai 49. 22.* urged in that conference as an argument by it selfe, to my best remembrance, however it were after disposed in the *birth-priviledge*. But saith Master *Blake*, the question here is not (as after your manner you mistake it) whether this text proves Infant-baptisme, but whether it gives any intimation, that Infants in the dayes of the Gospell be any members of the Church-visible, or intitled to any priviledges of the Covenant, as Christs Disciples. I reply, The proving of that intimation tended to prove Infant-baptisme, and therefore those words were alleaged for Infant-baptisme; which was that I said, not a whit mistaking the question. Now sith Master *Blake* confesseth that the words must needs be allegoricall, why doth he expound the terme sons and daughters of Infants, and tell us that their carriage of their little ones must be understood no otherwise then of the accesse of the Gentiles with their Infants to the Church of Christ. For if the Carriage, and nourishing *v. 23.* be allegoricall meant of perswasions, exhortations, and such like acts, Infants could not be thus carried And so Mr *Blakes* allegation is but an empty sound.

*Ch. 12.* Master *Blake* goes about to justify his speech that he used in his birth-priviledge, pag 22. that the precedent is an household. He that followeth the precedent, must baptize households. This speech I said, I marvaile much at it, and that it is very absurd, that I say no worse of it. Master *Blake* tels me, I expresse not the reason of so much marvaile. I answer the terme wherefore, with the words following expresse this reason plainely, sith as I said before in households were Infidels, if an household be the precedent to be followed; and he that followeth the precedent must baptize households without any other qualification; then when he baptizeth the beleieving master, he must baptize the unbeleieving servant, wife, &c. for they are of the household. Master *Blake*. If you had any worse to say, I wonder that you had not spoke it, your best friends I beleieve will say that you have sufficiently shewed your selfe absurd in language. Sure Master *Blake* knowes that a speech may be worse censured then by terming it very absurd, I might have cal-

S. 19.

of baptizing households & my censure of Mr *Blakes* speech concerning it.

led it sophisticall, deceitfull, and that had beene worse. My best friends can finde no abusive language of any mans person, their speeches or arguments I censure in no more absurd language then usually schollers do, and particularly Master Gataker doth Doctor Ames, and Voetius as I have shewed in this *Apology* above §.5. Master Blake addes, *I onely say some more learned then I, as learned as you have denied my words to be either absurd or heterodox.* Be it so; yet affection may blinde their eyes. But let us examine the speech. I reasoned thus, if the precedent to be followed be a household, then those of the household are to be baptized either because of the household; if this be said, then the Infidell wife is to be baptized because of the household, or because they professe the faith; and then the precedent is not a household, but a professor of faith. To this Master Blake, *For full answer I say, that wife and servant, as wife and servant, are in a capacity for baptisme: if any wife and servant were in those households they were baptized; else the Scripture would not have said the whole family was baptized. It is sufficient that Scripture mentioning baptisme of whole households, excepts none from a capacity of baptisme.* I reply, in that which he calls a full answer, there is no answer at all to my reason; for he neither denies my distinction to be sufficient, nor doth he tell us which member he will choose in the *Dilemma*, nor how he will avoid the consequent upon his choice. And therefore his learned friends, though they were ten times learneded then my selfe, yet in this are mistaken in acquitting either the former speech, or this answer, from absurdity. But let us consider what he sayes. *It is sufficient, that Scripture mentioning baptisme of whole households, excepts none from a capacity of baptisme.* I reply: Is this sufficient to make the baptizing of households the precedent, that is the pattern by which we may now baptize Infants, because Infants are not excepted? Then neither are Infidels excepted there; nor naturall fooles or idiots of ripe yeares, and so are to be the precedent of baptizing. *But wife and servant as wife and servant, are in a capacity for baptisme.* Answer. It is not true, that wife and servant as wife and servant are in a capacity for baptisme, if [as] betaken with reduplication, and [capacity] of actuall right, but as they are professors of faith. But if it be understood thus, *as wife, that is though wife, and capacity in respect of future possibility,* then



then it is true of an Infidell, of any man shall we therefore make an Infidell, or a man simply the precedent of baptizing? I said there's no reason why it should not be said as well, that baptizing *Samarita*, *Acts* 8.12. the 3000 *Acts* 2.42. all *Judea* *Matth.* 3.5; should be the precedent as baptizing of households, *Acts* 16. The faith Master *Blake*, if *Samarita* be converted, all *Judea* is taken for some considerable numbers out of every part of *Judea*. So say I, the terme household is taken *Acts* 16. for those of the house that being of growne yeares professed the faith. And so there's no precedent, therefor baptizing an Infant.

Chapt. 13. Mr *Blake* passing over all that I say to Mr *Marshalls* second argument, till pag. 145. concerning it tels me, that I might have given Mr *Marshal* leave to explain his own argument. And And I tell Mr *Blake* that so I did, and then did my part to shew what was faulty in it, so effectually that I conceive in his *Defence* he hath quitted it, and put another in its room, as weak as it; as I shewed above. But Mr *Blake* thinks it is sufficient to make the argument good, that infants of beleivers have an accesse in Gods ordinary way of dispensation, whilst infants: Here is a new phraseology, which serves for nothing but to puzzle; there is no face of an argument in it, and therefore I let it passe. To shew, how uncertaine the argument is from *Matth.* 19. 14. for infant-baptisme I produced *Piscators* reasons to prove that it is not cleare they were infants that were brought to Christ. These reasons I did not stick to, and so need not own what is contradictory to my exposition of *Matth.* 18.5. before. The second exception I took to the argument from *Matth.* 19. 14. I delivered onely doubtfully, and yet I conceived Mr *Marshalls* reason not cogent, for somewhat that Christ meant to teach by that Embleme of a little child could not be well resembled by a sheep, for though meeknesse might, yet not dociblenesse: I might have added that the similitude or Embleme of a sheep, had not so much decorum in it. But I stick not to that exposition of not including those infants, as conceiving not from Mr *Marshalls* or Mr *Blakes* reason, but from the circumstances of the thing, that Christ intended some extraordinary blessing to them, and declaration concerning them. As for Mr *Blakes* glosse he puts upon me, I disclaimed it; It is his owne mistake, not my conceit: that those infants, or infants of beleivers in infancy

S. 20.  
About *Mat.* 19  
14. that by the  
Kingdome of  
heaven is  
meant the  
Kingdome of  
glory.

*An Apologie for the two Treatises*

infancy have no interest in Christ, but are without Covenant of promise, without God, without hope. But for that I said; thirdly, that there is no certainty, onely conjecture that they were infants of beleevers, I avow it. Mr Blake averres a certainty beyond conjecture, because Christ was minister of the circumcision, Rom 15. 8. sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, Mat. 15. 24. carried himselfe otherwise to the Canaanitish woman in behalfe of her daughter, verse 22. 23. If these had had no other interest, Christ would have been as facile to others as to them. I reply, Christ was minister of the circumcision, was sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, yet cured the servant of the Centurion, the Samaritan leper, the daughter of the Syrophenician. He carried himselfe strangely at first to that woman, to provoke her faith, and he pleaded against her not that shee was not a beleever, but that shee was a Canaanite; if this reason prove any thing it is, that the childrens parents were Jewes, but that proves not they were beleevers; few of them beleeving on Christ, *John 1. 11.* Against the fourth thing I say of those children that were brought to Christ, that the speech [*of such is the kingdome of heaven*] is meant of the kingdome of glory, and that this is not common to all infants of beleevers; Mr Blake excepts that it is meant of the visible Church, and of all infants of beleevers as such: now on this hinge turns the fifth exception also, and so the answer to the whole argument I determine the Kingdome of heaven to be meant of the Kingdome of glory, and I thus prove it.

1 The Kingdome of God must be understood *Marke 10. 14.* as it is *verse 15.* and *Lu. 18. 16.* as *verse 17* and *Matth. 19. 14.* as it is in both those, this I prove, because our Saviour from their estate infers a likenesse to them in others for the same estate; but *Marke 10. 15.* *Luke 18. 17.* can be understood of no other then the Kingdome of glory, the proposition being false, being understood of the visible Church; many proud men entering therem, as *Simon Magnus, Diotrophes, &c.* ergo it must be understood of the Kingdome of glory.

2 From this that our Saviour directs the speech *Marke 10. 15.* *Luke 18. 17.* to his Disciples who were already in the visible Church, therefore the requiring a further condition to the Kingdome of God shewes he meant it of the Kingdome of glory.

3 The



3 The speech Marke 10.15. Luke 18.17. is like Mar. 18.3,4. but there it is meant of the Kingdome of glory, ergo so here.

Deodate on Matth. 19.14. so farre are you deceived in thinking that children, by reason of their weakenesse and contemptible qualitie; are unworthy to be presented unto me: that contrariwise nobody is capable of my Kingdom unless he be first by the spirit of regeneration brought into a spirituall estate to be like a little child in the order of nature. The new annot: on the Bible on Matth. 19.14. yee have no reason to blame them for bringing children to me; for they may be such as have interest to the Kingdome of heaven, as well as others of ripe yeares: and, unlesse yee be like them, ye shall never come there, ch. 18.3.

But saith Master Blake, Christ had never been so much displeased with his Disciples for forbidding them, seeing their election and justification was to the Disciples wholly unknown, they had a present visible title, such as the Apostles ought to have knowne. I answer, The reason of Christs anger was their hindering him in his designe, not the knowledge they had of their present visible title: this is but a dreame.

I added further, that Christs action in this was extraordinary, and so no ordinary rule for baptizing by the Publike ministry. Mr Blake would have me consider how this can stand with that I said before, that they that brought the Infants might do it without faith in Christ, as the Messiah upon the fame of his miracles, and account that he was a Prophet. I answer, there is no opposition, they might conceive him to be but a Prophet, not the Messiah: and yet Christ might act as an extraordinary Prophet, and as the Messiah, Mr Blake sayes, this act of Christ is no direct precedent for baptisme, but for Church-priviledges of which Infants are capable. Marke this speech, if [but] be adversative, then Master Blake grants that Infants are capable of Church-priviledges, not of baptisme, which overthrowes all his dispute; but the truth is, this thing was done to these Infants, not by reason of any visible title they had, or to enter them into any outward Church-priviledge, but to accomplish by his blessing, their interest in the invisible Kingdome of God by election.

Master Blake in the close of this chapter sayes, if it were true, that paedobaptisme had no more warrant then I conceive, yet it were

not will-worship, but a misapplication of an instituted ordinance to a person. But I aske Master Blake, whether Infant-Communion were not will worship? whether baptizing of bells were not will-worship? and yet these are but misapplications of an instituted ordinance to a wrong subject. We have the word *will-worship* but once, *Col. 2. 23.* and if it be taken in the worser sense, as Protestant Divines hitherto have done (though lately Doctor Hammond at Oxford hath written a booke to prove it to be taken in the better part for a commendable thing as a free-well offering) and have made it the sinne of the Pharises *Matth. 15. 9.* and especially non-conformists, who have made every invented ceremony will-worship, then much more Infant baptisme being worship it selfe, if it be not instituted, must be will-worship.

§. 21.  
That God  
seales not to  
every person  
that is rightly  
baptized, that  
his Covenant  
of grace be-  
longs onely to  
the elect, that  
his Covenant  
is effectually,  
and leaves it  
not to mans  
liberty to in-  
clude or ex-  
clude himself.

Chapt. 15. Master Blake examines what I say, *Examen pag. 164.* about Gods sealing. Master Marshall spake of Gods sealing the baptized; I said, God seales not to every one that is baptized, but onely to true beleivers: For his sealing, is the confirming of his promise; but God promiseth righteousness to none but true beleivers. Master Blake answers. *You acknowledge baptisme to be in its nature a seale of the righteousness of faith, and to be of God, therefore in it God must seale to every baptized person, or else you must say they are not baptized.* I reply: I acknowledge baptisme of professors of faith to be of God, though they be not true beleivers: and I acknowledge baptisme in its nature to be a seale of the covenant of God, but not a seale actually, but aptitudinally; that is, all right baptism is in its nature apt to seale, as a garland hung out is to signify wine to be sold, yet actually the one signifies so onely to the intelligent, and the other onely to true beleivers. And God never seales actually till a person be a beleever. I said; *As for the sealing by God upon condition persons agize the Covenant; it is but a notion; the Scripture makes not Gods promise in the Covenant of grace conditionall in that sense.* For Gods promise is for those he entets into Covenant with, that he will put his lawes in their hearts, and in their mindes will write them; *Heb. 10. 16.* Master Blake answers. *If you meane this of the Sacraments as the words beare, then according to your opinion none ought to be baptized, but he in whose heart the law is wrote.* I answer him, By Gods sealing I doe not meane every right administration of baptisme; for though that be in its nature apt to seale the



the graces of the Covenant, yet actually Gods seales not but when it is administred to a beleever. It may be called a right act of the administratour according to Gods appointment, but not Gods sealing. I call Gods sealing onely when either by his spirit or oath, or outward rite, he assures his grace, as by circumcision to *Abraham*, *Rom. 4. 11.* he appointed *Ismael* to be circumcised, but did not seale to him righteousness by faith. The inference Mr *Blake* makes from my words, *as if I held none baptizable, but those in whose heart Gods law is written*, hath no colour, for I do not make the administratours baptizing, or, sith they will have it so called, sealing, to be Gods sealing. God appoints the word to be preached to many hypocrites, and the preacher that assures them of the promises doth it by Gods appointment, yet God doth not assure the promises to them. I do not make him onely baptizable to whom God seales, but him whom Christ appoints to be baptized, whether God seales to him or no. Master *Blake* urgeth me with *Bellarmines* argument; *If the Sacraments be seales of grace, they are often false, and God should beare witness to a lye, and tels of the speech of some that have said, that this argument is unanswerable; unlesse we confesse that the seale of the Sacrament is conditionall.* I like not to call the Sacrament a conditionall seale, for that which seales doth assure, and supposeth the condition: In my apprehension, that which is called conditionall sealing is not sealing but offering, or propounding, or representing: but about this I will not contend. Yet in that sense I yeeld it to be a seale actually, I yeeld it to be a seale onely to beleivers, but I deny that because the Sacrament is in its nature a seale of grace, God doth seale alwayes when it is rightly administred. The nature of it is to be a seale aptitudinall, not actuall; and so it is easie to answer *Bellarmines* argument, without crossing my speeches. But be the Sacraments seales conditionall or absolute, actuall or aptitudinall, what is this to prove that *God seales conditionally in this sense, as if God left it to mans liberty, to whom he had sealed, to agnize or recognize that sealing, or to free themselves, if they please, and so nullify all; yet so as to afford them a while the favour, and privilege of being in Covenant with him, which Master Marshall I conceived meant by his conditionall sealing, and I find not in his answer a deniall of it to be his meaning.* Master *Blake* excepts against

gainst a speech of mine, in which I say, That all the Sacraments of the Jewes are abrogated circumstance, and substance in whole and in part: and askes me. *Is circumcision of heart abrogated? Is all spirituall meat and drinke in Sacraments abrogated? Is Christ himselfe abrogated?* I answer, no: but withall say, these are idle questions as not crossing my speech, unlesse he can prove circumcision of the heart, spirituall meat and drinke, and Christ himselfe to be Sacraments.

Sect. 2. Master Blake would acquit this speech, Gods Covenant of grace is common to elect and reprobates from symbolizing with Arminians, by producing the speeches of Pareus, and Mr Ball who onely say reprobates are in Covenant with God externally, or God externally contracts with them, which is another thing. Gods Covenant of grace, is his promise of grace; and of this truly, Master Marshall in his defence page 117. *multitudes were baptized, to whom God yet never gave saving graces, and therefore never promised them, for had he made a promise, he would have performed it.* Master Blake makes the nature of a Covenant an agreement between two parties, and sayes, a promise or tender without consent, is no Covenant. How then do children Covenant at baptisme, or enter into Covenant who yeeld no consent? He saith, Gods tender of himselfe to his people is called his Covenant. Gen. 17.7.9. But he doth not rightly call that a tender, which was more then a tender to wit a promise. Then he objects against himselfe, that if Gods Covenant be such as he will not breake, Jerem. 31.32. and he hath promised to put his lawes in their inward parts, then they all to whom he makes Covenant must be elect. I answer saith he, if we take the words exactly, as in the letter of the prophecy they run. then all ministry is beaten downe, and all edification ceases. But this is *litem lite resolvere*. The Contraremonstrantes when they urge this place for effectuell grace, understand the words exactly. But how will Master Blake understand them? I have looked over almost two leaves in answer to this in Master Blake, and cannot tell how he will understand them; nor finde I that he gives any direct answer to the objection, but wanders in impertinences. Nor knowe I how he can answer the objection without evervating the argument for effectuell grace and perseverance in it. And the not teaching one another there spoken of, is  
meant



meant of that obscure teaching which was under the Law.

*Seet. 3.* He intimates that *I* have misreported Master *Marshall*, but Master *Marshall* hath not himselfe denied the sense *I* conceived of his conditionall sealing by God to Infants, the words are plaine enough in his Sermon, pag. 49. where he talkes of Gods Covenant, and sealing, and Christs suretiship, more like *Corvinus*, or the *Arminians*, then the *Scripture* or *Contraremonstrants*. Master *Blake* accuseth me of joyning with *Independents*, and that they will have none Church members, but elect, and I no Church but that which is invisible. But *I* beleeve he wrongs both me and them; me *I* am sure, for *I* alwayes teach a visible profession sufficient for Church-membership, though *I* deny that every visible professour is in the Covenant of grace; and when they will have reall saints Church members, they meane not onely such as are so before God, but such as are so in the judgement of the Church. Though *I* thinke they are more rigid then they should be in their tenet, yet *I* thinke Master *Blake* wrongs them in this imputation.

*Ch. 16.* *I* told Mr *Marshall* that his speech of *Anabaptists* as condemning infants as out of the state of grace, condemning all the infants of the whole Church of Christ as having nothing to doe with the Covenant of Grace, till proved by some of their testimonies *I* should take to be but a false accusation. Mr *Blake* tels me Master *Marshall* for a testimony needs look no further then the top of your lease, where you say infant-baptisme is a corruption of the ordinance of baptisme; If infants be not only held from baptisme, but their baptisme is also a corruption of that ordinance, and there is no such thing as Covenant-holinesse to give them any title or interest, then they are out of covenant, strangers to the promises of God, and so the doom Eph. 2. 12. lyes heavy upon them. How frivolous a justification is this of an expresse and deep accusation of men of a rash and bloody sentence as condemning all the infants of the whole Church of Christ, as having nothing to do with the covenant of grace; me thinks a man that would accuse so expressely so many persons, and those christian brethren not to be contemned of so deep, so passion-provoking a charge enough to stirre up Magistrates and parents to expell and destroy such men, should produce better evidence for such a crimination, then such a farre fetcht consequence as Mr *Blake* here brings, to make it good

Of Mr *Blakes* unjust crimination of me as putting the children of beleevers out of the covenant of grace, and the epilogue of this postscript.

is neither my name nor peace more tenderly regarded by Master *Blake* then upon such light inference to accuse me so deeply? I had said to Mr *Marshall* that if the covenant of grace bee rightly understood, Mr *Marshall* excludes infants as much from the covenant of grace as I doe. As for Mr *Blake* not only page 14 of his Birth-priviledge, but also page 23 of his answer to my letter, he expressly maintaines that the birth-right he maintaines as a fruit from the covenant of free-grace to all in the faith, and their seed onely entitles to outward priviledges. How doth this stand with that which he asserts chap. 3. sect. 2. of his answer to my letter, page 13. that infants of beleivers have salvation if they dye in their infancy, by verue of the Covenant? For if the Covenant onely entitle to outward priviledges how doth it entitle to salvation? So that to speak plainly, Mr *Blake* doth but play fast and loose, sometimes asserting a certainty of salvation from the covenant, sometimes onely a right to outward priviledges; and yet he and Mr *Marshall* stick not to declaim against *Anabaptists*, for not assuring salvation to the deceasing infants of beleivers from that covenant which Mr *Marshall* will not assert, pag. 116. as it is a Covenant of saving grace to be made to beleivers and their naturall seed, and Mr *Blake* saith, onely entitles to outward priviledges. But we say, saith Master *Blake* that all infants and men of yeers for ought that we can find from any Scripture grounds are utterly lost that want all right of Baptisme. He might say they are in danger to be lost by reason of originall corruption, not for want of right to Baptisme; but to say they are utterly lost is more then Mr *Blake* hath ground to affirme. I have often shewed that a right to baptism is from the command of Christ, not from such covenant holinelle as Mr *Blake* asserts: salvation comes from Gods election and Christs redemption. It is a meer slander, and a groundlesse crimination, wherewith Mr *Blake* chargeth me, that the position he produceth out of my book, or any other he can produce doth inferre, that all the infants of the whole Church of Christ have nothing to doe with the Covenant of grace. I challenge him, with Mr *Marshall* and Mr *Blakes* seconds Mr *Calamy* and Mr *Vines*, if they can to make that charge good; or else let Mr *Blake* and Mr *Marshall* retract it. As for Mr *Blakes* conclusion, I conceive his Protestation makes him deservedly the object of pittie, his motions carry a sting in the  
tayle,



tayl, to wit a false accusation, from which I doubt not but I have acquitted my selfe by this writing. The elogy the worthy member of the house of Commons bestowes on me, and the unrighteous censure of my learned namelesse acquaintance I value not; books as meats relish differently with different palates, *pro capiti lectoris habent sua fata libelli*: This apollogy will state me, and my writing better in their thoughts, if they can & will understand the truth. If not, the same spirit that hath enabled me to beare greater burthens, I trust will enable me to beare these hard censures. I hope that I shall not be wanting to the overthrow of any errors, according to my ability; pædobaptisme I am more assured then ever is a great corruption, tounded as now it is taught on very great errors, and of any service I suppose I can doe to God it is one of the chiefe which I ought to apply my selfe to, that it may be cleared to be an error. I bear as much love and reverence to M. Blake as ever, he is not *despised* by me though his errors be freely censured. I aimed not either in the former or in this latter writing at any grievance to him, and should be sorry this controversie should make a separation between us, though I find by experience much estrangednes in many of my former acquaintance from me. And for encountring with Mr Blake for the truths sake I held my selfe necessitated to it by reason of Mr Vines and M. Calamy their former, and latter, as I still conceive, inconsiderate *plaudite*.

---

F I N I S.

---